

Xavier University

Exhibit

Faculty Scholarship

English

Spring 2016

Ohio Journal for Teacher Educator

Sally M. Barnhart M.Ed.
Xavier University

Follow this and additional works at: https://www.exhibit.xavier.edu/english_faculty



Part of the [Language and Literacy Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Barnhart, Sally M. M.Ed., "Ohio Journal for Teacher Educator" (2016). *Faculty Scholarship*. 587.
https://www.exhibit.xavier.edu/english_faculty/587

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the English at Exhibit. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of Exhibit. For more information, please contact exhibit@xavier.edu.



The **OHIO** Journal of Teacher Education

SPRING 2016. VOLUME 30. NUMBER 1

The **OHIO** Journal of Teacher Education

SPRING 2016 . VOLUME 30 . NUMBER 1

PUBLISHED BY THE OHIO ASSOCIATION OF TEACHER EDUCATORS

Dr. D. Mark Meyers, Xavier University
Dr. Jean F. Eagle, Miami University
EDITORS

CONTENTS

Message from the Editors	1
Editorial Board	3
A Call for Editorial Board Membership	4
 ARTICLES	
Co-Teaching in Teacher Preparation: Where Everyone is a Learner	5
<i>Gail Saunders-Smith, Ph.D., Youngstown State University</i> <i>Terri L. Duncko, Ph.D., Youngstown State University</i>	
Re-Examining Progress Monitoring: Are We Reporting What We Think We Are?	13
<i>Kathleen G. Winterman, Ed.D., Xavier University</i> <i>Clarissa Rosas, Ph.D., Mount St. Joseph University</i>	
Shifting the Paradigm of Identity in Students Who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing in General Education	35
<i>Megan Reister PhD, Franciscan University of Steubenville</i>	
Fostering Leadership in Early Childhood Teacher Candidates: Case Studies from Three Ohio Universities	55
<i>Pam Owen Ed.D, Mount Vernon Nazarene University</i> <i>Mary Barbara Trube, Ed.D, Ohio University, Chillicothe</i> <i>Krishana White, Ph.D., Mount Vernon Nazarene University</i> <i>Laurie Katz, Ph.D., The Ohio State University</i>	
Teaching Reading is a Passion: A Passion with Impact	69
<i>Sally Barnhart, M.Ed, Xavier University</i> <i>Rita Bitzer, M.Ed.,</i>	
Publication and Manuscript Guidelines	81
Important Dates of Note	82
Membership	83



A MESSAGE FROM THE EDITORS

Welcome from the The OHIO Journal of Teacher Education Editorial Team. We are honored and privileged to shepherd this journal for the educational community of Ohio

The OHIO Journal of Teacher Education (OJTE) is an online journal. We invite all forms of article formats, as seen in the publication and manuscript guidelines included inside the journal. However, we do invite authors to utilize the online format. The use of links and other interactive devices will allow the online journal to be more than simply a pdf of articles that you can print at your own workstation. In the future, the hope of the editorial team is to develop a truly functional online journal experience which can open the world of practice to our readership.

We will strive to build upon the solid foundation left by the previous editorial teams and move the OHIO Journal of Teacher Education forward as a resource for pre-service teachers, in-service teachers, and all with an interest in teacher education.

Dr. Jean Eagle and Dr. Mark Meyers, Co-Editors





EDITORIAL BOARD

Michele Beery, Ph.D.
Wilmington College

Stacey Pistorova, Ph.D.
Heidelberg University

Cynthia Bertelsen, Ph.D.
Bowling Green State University

Carol Ramsay, Ed. D.
Lake Erie College

Sue Corbin, Ph.D.
*Notre Dame
College of Ohio*

Linda Ingling Rogness, Ph.D.
Muskingum University

Joy Cowdery, Ph.D.
Muskingum University

Marlissa Stauffer, Ph.D.
Ohio Dominican University

Todd Hawley, Ph. D.
Kent State University

Nicole Williams, Ph. D.
*University of
Findlay*





A CALL FOR EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERSHIP

The Ohio Journal of Teacher Education (OJTE) is looking for interested individuals to join the Editorial Board of the journal. We are looking to establish a board that represents the Colleges and Universities of Ohio as well as offers a broad spectrum of content expertise.

If interested, please submit a one page letter of intent that includes your College or University, your educational background, and your content area of interest to the co-editors.

Dr. Mark Meyers and Dr. Jean Eagle at
oatejournal@gmail.com

We look forward to hearing from you.

Co-Teaching in Teacher Preparation: Where Everyone is a Learner

Gail Saunders-Smith, Ph.D. and Terri L. Duncko, Ph.D.

* Correspondence:
Gail Saunders-Smith, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Youngstown State University
Beeghly College of Education
Teacher Education
Department
One University Plaza
Youngstown, Ohio 44555
gasaunderssmith@ysu.edu
330-941-1353
Full list of author
information is available at
the end of the article

Abstract:

A light-hearted look at an example of practicing what one teaches is addressed in this article. One model of co-teaching with two faculty members is described in terms of need, execution, preparation, reflection, and student perception. Rooted in the research, the article examines what the co-teachers learned about teaching, content, students, each other, and themselves.

Pregnancy provides so many opportunities in so many ways! When an early childhood colleague began her maternity leave mid-semester, her courses were passed on to other colleagues to complete the semester. The mother-to-be was extremely organized and provided ample, detailed plans, resources, assessments, rubrics, and suggestions for those who would step in for her. Areas of expertise, availability, work load, and interest were considerations when placing faculty in her courses. Every effort was made to match up content experts with the courses that needed covered; and, for the most part, that happened. Until recently, co-teaching was not practiced in our department beyond the occasional stepping in for a colleague to provide a lecture on an aspect of particular interest or expertise. What follows is the story of Terri and Gail's great, unintended, co-teaching adventure.

One of the courses needing coverage concerned the teaching of early childhood language arts content and pedagogy to teacher candidates completing their pre-clinical experience. While not assigned to take on this course, I had taught it several years ago and so was familiar with the content since my areas of expertise include early and middle childhood literacy. Terri has several areas of expertise – special education, library science, as well as middle childhood and adolescent/young adult literacy.

As a former special education teacher, Terri was required to teach a variety of grade levels in all major content areas. It was thought that this broad experience would provide a strong foundation for taking over the early childhood course.

The students in this course met on campus twice each week for 1.5 hours for the first eight weeks of the 15-week semester. During that time, the students also spent two days in the field at their placement sites observing and assisting. The teacher candidates spent the remaining weeks of the semester full-time at their placement sites. Day one of the on-campus classes involved lecture, hands-on applications, discussion, and typical content learning practices. In the second class meeting each week the students generally presented applications and demonstrations of what they had been learning. Terri was assigned to teach the on-campus classes and then to observe the candidates at their field placements. A few weeks into the semester, Terri and I agreed to share the delivery of the content on day one each week and then Terri would oversee the students' applications on day two while I was working in a school on another project.

Co-Teaching in General

Most of us are familiar with the concept and models of co-teaching and its place in general and special education. However, the idea of co-teaching in higher education is less familiar. As Duchardt, Marlow, Inman, Christensen and Reeves (1999) point out, "Opportunities for co-teaching and co-teaching are not inherent within the structure of higher education (p. 186)." When opportunities for co-teaching do present themselves, however, good things can happen as we witnessed. The model of co-teaching we used seemed to be a hybrid rather than an exact match with one of the traditional structures. For example, our students remained in one whole group which eliminated the *parallel*, *station*, and *alternative* teaching structures. Similarly, neither the *one teach/one assist* nor the *team teaching* models were used; which leaves the *one teach/one observe* model. The nature of our interaction involved a variation on the information gathering aspect inherent in the *one teach/one observe* model. Rather than just gathering information about the students and their learning, our opportunity allowed for the gathering of knowledge specific to the layers of content.

The idea of collaborative construction of knowledge offered by Harris and Harvey (2000) resembles a feature of the *one teach/one observe* model we implemented. While Terri and I are

knowledgeable in literacy, Harris and Harvey (2000) remind us that our expectations for content delivery and responses to student engagement have been shaped by our own teaching/learning experiences and academic backgrounds. Silero (2011) reiterates this idea by pointing out that “Co-teachers come together with dissimilar personal and professional values... (p. 34).” Literacy, like all learning, is developmental so the delivery of the course content by two instructors representing literacy learning at two developmental places along the literacy continuum – early and middle childhood – provided a unique opportunity for the students to hear the content from both perspectives. We were able to position the knowledge and skills in ways that provided our teacher candidates relevant illustrations of the need to differentiate instructional practices for the multiple stages of development they will find in their classrooms.

Additionally, because the students were already in the field two days a week, course content was often correlated to those field experiences, thus providing a deeper relevance to authentic learning.

Our Experience

Silero (2011) shares the resemblance of co-teaching to a professional marriage that was first offered by Scruggs, Mastropieri and McDuffie (2007). Using this analogy, she describes the process of developing a co-teaching relationship between the partners and the need for collaboration, flexibility, and compromise – similar to the steps of courtship, engagement, and eventual marriage. Ours was more of an arranged marriage built by circumstance; almost a marriage of convenience between friends.

The need for planning in co-teaching experiences is well documented (Volger and Long, 2003; Sileo, 2011; Duchart, et. al., 1999; Zapf, et. al., 2011). Communication is essential to any relationship, especially when co-constructing events designed to change cognitive behavior as in any effective teaching/learning situation. Our colleague had provided us with explicit plans for what, when, and how to teach the content and applications; all we needed to do was determine who would do what. What developed became much more, however.

Planning beforehand was fairly typical, we would examine the content and resources and determine how much of the time would be allotted for delivery and application. Our conversations after class, however, highlighted the expanding knowledge base for both of us – an unexpected, pleasant surprise. Crow and Smith (2005) indicate that conversations between team-teaching faculty

allow for the deconstruction of instructional events which can lend a reflective dimension to the teaching-learning dynamic, and that is what Terri and I experienced. Certainly, we talked about individual students and aspects of their discrete learning and interactions with classmates, but it was the discussion of content that was an unexpected benefit.

Terri's practical experience with middle and secondary grade students lent a firsthand dimension to the content that I had not experienced. While I had the 'book-learning' knowledge of literacy development in adolescent and young adult learners, I had limited involvement with learners of this age. Terri's perspective on literacy development beyond the early years enriched and expanded my knowledge base and the same was true for Terri. Her reflections of our early childhood literacy conversations revealed an excitement and growing awareness for the literacy needs of young children and how those skills developed over time. It proved to be a perfect partnership.

Another facet of increased learning for us was the sharing of resources. While our colleague had provided ample resources, Terri and I also used materials and exemplars with which we were familiar. For example, a content segment addressed visual literacy. Both Terri and I have extensive personal collections of children's literature, so each of us brought books that provided examples of the various elements of visual literacy. Another example involved having our teacher candidates examine the writing development of young children. I was able to provide authentic writing examples from children at different stages of development that I had collected over the years. Using my own pool of samples was a benefit since I was familiar with them and could easily guide the students' examination. In addition, Terri and I shared the use of videos and websites with which we were familiar to illustrate concepts and procedures.

Our experience mirrors what Zapf, et. al. (2011) and Duchardt, et. al., (1999) report to be true. We realized the 'hidden rewards' of learning from each other with regard to content, being able to respond to each other's materials and examples, and challenging our own understanding, all of which helped us develop as teachers and professionals (Zapf, et. al., 2011, p. 49). Examples of the rewards offered by Zapf and his colleagues were the same for us. Terri and I shared the scoring of the midterm, learning about each other's grading practices and priorities. We also learned about each other's teaching styles, techniques, and strategies. And, like with Zapf's colleagues, an increased level of trust and respect developed which kept the work fresh, interesting, and fun (Zapf, et. al., 2011, p.49). We agree with Duchardt's, et. al., (1999) suggestion that the increase of new

understandings on both parts was similar to enriched personal and practical professional development for us.

Our Students' Experience

The experience was personally and professionally enriching for both of us, but what about for our students? Volger and Long (2003) point out the importance of “us[ing] each other’s strengths, insights, and experiences to create lessons and activities that not only define and develop important points and ideas, but also maintain a high level of student interest (p. 123).” Our students seemed to appreciate the different voices that guided their learning.

The students saw immediately the benefits of having two professors instruct the course and expressed this several times throughout the semester. Because of our easy collaborative relationship the students could see a give and take of content delivery that was sprinkled with characteristics of each of our personalities. Since the students were already in the field, they came to class with specific questions regarding student development, strategy instruction and behavior management techniques. Terri’s special education background and my early childhood experience provided the students with the depth of knowledge needed to respond to classroom concerns.

What's Next

While our co-teaching experience was relatively short and certainly informal, it unquestionably helped us as instructors and we realize the potential gains for our teacher candidates. The benefits were so great that Terri and I would like to see this model expand to other courses. However, change is never easy and in light of the bureaucratic maze, long-held educational traditions, the beast known as scheduling, and the thousand other known and unknown obstacles that thwart modifications in higher education, we don’t anticipate moving quickly into the co-teaching realm.

Nevertheless, we feel that a version or aspects of the experience can be tried. Because Terri and I learned so much about the content, resources, strategies, and so on, perhaps the same can happen outside of a co-teaching experience. For example, our literacy faculty have been working to revise the content, assignments, assessments, resources, and rubrics of the reading courses. Informal sharing of these revisions have taken place during the monthly literacy committee meetings. Perhaps additional sessions can be planned to address the specifics of each course as it is revamped.

In the past, learning communities that address particular concepts have been formed and found to be successful. Perhaps a learning community can be established to formally share the revisions; or, in the spirit of co-teaching, instructors can bring their own expertise into one another's classrooms. One element already in place is a site on the department website where electronic versions of resources are stored in files by course. Faculty are encouraged to place items there that they are willing to share with others teaching the course.

The analogy of a village is needed to raise a child has been expanded by Duchardt, et. al. (1999) to 'it takes a whole school to educate a child.' Perhaps we can expand it further to say that it takes a department to train the teachers.

References

- Crow, J. & Smith, L. (2005). Co-teaching in higher education: Reflective conversation on shared experience as continued professional development for lecturers and health and social care students. *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 6 (4), 491-506.
- Duchardt, B., Marlow, L., Inman, D., Christensen, P., & Reeves, M. (1999, January/February). Collaboration and co-teaching: General and special education faculty. *The Clearing House*, 72(3), 186-190.
- Harris, C. & Harvey, A. N. C. (2000). Team Teaching in Adult Higher Education Classrooms: Toward Collaborative Knowledge Construction. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, Fall (87), 25-32.
- Scruggs, T. E. (2007). Co-Teaching in inclusive classrooms: A metasynthesis of qualitative research. *Exceptional Children*, 47, 392-416.
- Silero, J. M. (2011). Co-Teaching: Getting to Know Your Partner. *Council for Exceptional Children*, 43 (5), 32-38.
- Volger, K. E. & Long, E. (2003). Team Teaching Two Sections of the Same Undergraduate Course: A Case Study. *College Teaching*, 51 (4), 122-126.
- Zapf, M. K. Jersome, L., & Williams, M. (2011). Team Teaching in Social Studies: Sharing Power with Bachelor of Social Work Students. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 31, 38-52.

About the Authors:

Gail Saunders-Smith, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Youngstown State University
Beeghly College of Education
Teacher Education Department
One University Plaza
Youngstown, Ohio 44555
gasaunderssmith@ysu.edu
330-941-1353 w

Terri L. Duncko, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Youngstown State University
Beeghly College of Education
Teacher Education Department
One University Plaza
Youngstown, Ohio 44555
tlduncko@ysu.edu
330-941-1320 w

Gail Saunders-Smith teaches undergraduate and graduate reading courses in the early and middle childhood programs at YSU where she is coordinator of the literacy program. Her research interests include early literacy development, teacher-learner discourse, and the design and implementation of professional development.

Terri Duncko teaches undergraduate and graduate reading courses in the early and middle childhood programs at YSU. Her research interests include the use of instructional strategies and technology as a means to increase student learning and engagement; along with how to effectively implement differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners.

Re-Examining Progress Monitoring: Are We Reporting What We Think We Are?

Kathleen G. Winterman, Ed.D. and Clarissa Rosas, Ph.D.

* Correspondence:
Kathleen Winterman.
Xavier University
School of Education
3800 Victory Parkway
Cincinnati, Ohio 45207
Wintermank1@xavier.edu
Full list of author
information is available at
the end of the article

Abstract:

Legislation mandates that special education service providers report their students with disabilities progress in attaining IEP goals on a regular basis. These reports are referred to as progress monitoring. Progress monitoring is considered an evidence based practice that requires frequent, systematic, and consistent assessments to directly measure both the student's growth in meeting IEP goals and the teaching practices employed to address the skills delineated in the IEP. This study investigated the practice of progress monitoring in a Midwestern suburban public school district. Findings from this study suggest that progress reports lack effective communication as to the advancement of students' goal attainment and adjustments made to instruction, as it pertains to growth toward the IEP goal, was not evident.

Historically, a pattern of marginalization, denial of services, and discrimination of children with disabilities has plagued the educational school system. In 1975 Congress took action to address this unacceptable pattern by passing the first national special education law, PL 94-142. This initial special education law included two essential principles which continue to be critical to the services extended to children with disabilities: free appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restricted environment (LRE) possible. This national legislation, PL 94-142, has been reauthorized in subsequent years, each time strengthening access to general education for students with special needs and holding schools more accountable for the progress of these children. The plan for providing services and access to general education is referred to as the Individualized Education Program (IEP). This document serves as the foundation of the student's free appropriate public education (Gartin & Murdick, 2005). Educational teams including families are charged with identifying goals aimed at improving the educational outcome for a specific child in need of special education services in the least restricted environment.

Literature Review

The No Child Left Behind Legislation of 2001 (NCLB 2001) combined with the 2004 reauthorization of the special education law, known as Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA 2004), strengthened the school's responsibility to account for the effectiveness of the services and instruction they deliver to attain the IEP goals. This emphasis on accountability of outcomes of services and instruction was driven by the historical poor educational results reported for students with disabilities. To address these poor results, IDEA 2004 mandates that educational teams not only identify goals that focus on the individual needs of a child with disability, but to specify how the child's progress in attaining those goals will be measured and communicated to parents. As noted in the federal regulation below, the IEP must detail how the child's progress toward meeting the IEP goal will be communicated.

Regulations: Part [300](#) / [D](#) / [300.320](#) / a

(3) A description of--

(i) How the child's progress toward meeting the annual goals described in paragraph (2) of this section will be measured; and

(ii) When periodic reports on the progress the child is making toward meeting the annual goals (such as through the use of quarterly or other periodic reports, concurrent with the issuance of report cards) will be provided;

(4) A statement of the special education and related services and supplementary aids and services, based on peer-reviewed research to the extent practicable, to be provided to the child, or on behalf of the child, and a statement of the program modifications or supports for school personnel that will be provided to enable the child--

The purpose of this directive is not only to assure that students make sufficient gains toward their IEP goals, but to keep teachers and parents consistently informed about their student's progress in meeting IEP goals prior to any IEP meeting. Hence, this type of progress monitoring requires frequent, systematic, and consistent assessments be in place to directly measure both the student's growth in meeting IEP goals and the teaching practices employed to address the skills delineated in

the IEP goals. This practice of progress monitoring is considered an evidence-based practice which results in increased student learning outcomes and effective teacher decision-making (Deno, 2003; Fuchs, Good & Jefferson, 1998; Deno, & Mirkin, 1984). In addition, research supports that progress monitoring is one of the major factors that differentiate effective from ineffective instruction (Espin, Wallace, Lembke, Campbell, & Long, 2010).

Despite the research which supports progress monitoring as an evidence-based practice and legislation that safeguards positive outcomes for students with disabilities, students with disabilities continue to lag behind their non-disabled peers (U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics, 2014; Goodman, Hazelkorn, Bucholz, Duffy, & Kitta, 2011). The U.S. National Assessment of Educational Progress (2014) indicates that not only are the majority of students with disabilities not meeting state proficiencies, but the large achievement gaps between students with and without disabilities remains. The U.S. National Center on Educational Outcomes (2014) indicates that a sustained division between the performance of children with disabilities and those without a disability exists in the area of mathematics and reading persists. As students with disabilities reach middle and high school, the gap widens. While legislation requires that only research based strategies be used when teaching children with disabilities, it is important to match those strategies with the unique needs of the student. Therefore, teachers must be continually informed about the effectiveness of their instructional practices and its' effect in achieving the required growth necessary to attain IEP goals. Roach, Chilungu, La Salle, Talapatra, & Vignieri, (2009) state in order for IEPs to serve as the primary means of facilitating curricular access and to improve student academic outcomes for students with disabilities, educational systems need to provide professional development and increased IEP quality monitoring to ensure that the goals and services outlined in the IEP are monitored and implemented as planned.

The Special Education Resource for General Education (SERGE, 2014) states that monitoring students' progress is a shared responsibility among educational team members to determine acquisition of IEP goals and objectives. Gathering this data is a critical responsibility and requires that information is collected by multiple team members such as general educators, related service personnel, fine arts teachers, as well as the special educator. However, in practice, the special education teacher's role is to coordinate the collection and monitoring of students' progress (ODE, 2015).

The purpose of this descriptive pilot case study was to investigate the status of Progress Reports and special education service providers' perceptions of the reports they prepared to keep parents informed about their child's growth and progress towards meeting IEP goals and objectives.

Methods

A convenient sample Midwest suburban public school district agreed to participate in the study. At a May, 2015, Special Services meeting lead by the district leadership team, special education service providers discussed the IEP Progress Reports that are provided to parents and were told that this would be an area of focus for the upcoming academic year. Faculty members were asked if they would like to participate in a study that would provide the district with baseline information that would prompt their discussion during the following school year. Seventeen staff members agreed to participate in the study and completed the Teacher's Progress Reporting Survey. Using the Progress Monitoring Report that the participants prepared, they completed surveys and the Progress Monitoring Reporting with all students personal identification information was redacted. Then the information was submitted anonymously in an envelope which was kept at the district's Special Services Office. Teachers also completed a Teacher IEP Survey questionnaire which was designed to provide the researchers with additional information regarding their level of education,

experience, and familiarity with the IEP process. This was also tendered anonymously in an envelope in the district's Special Services Office.

Instrumentation

In order to determine the status of the Progress Monitoring Reports and special service providers' perceptions of their reports a survey was developed. Survey was developed by the researchers as a result of their extensive review of IDEA 2004, experience in teacher preparation, and professional development for current teachers. A sample Survey was reviewed by experienced educators in the field of administration which resulted in minor edits to the Survey. The Survey consisted of three sections: The first section contained five demographic questions that described the student for whom the IEP progress monitoring report was written. The second section of the Survey comprised of twelve elements directly related to key areas in the progress report in which the participants selected a response that best described the particular element reviewed. The third section of the Survey involved word pairs that each participant was asked to rank using a seven-point Likert-type scale that best described their perceptions toward the progress report that they prepared for parents.

Results

The purpose of this descriptive pilot study was to investigate the status of progress reports and special education providers' perceptions of the reports that they prepared to keep parents informed about their child's growth in meeting IEP goals and objectives. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data obtained from the special education service provider participants' responses to the researchers' survey in order to summarize the status of progress reports and to present possible patterns that emerged from the data collected. Results of the survey were categorized into five

sections: participants; setting; students' demographics; key elements of the progress reports; and the participants' beliefs about the progress reports that they prepared for parents.

Participants

Participants in this study consisted of 14 teachers and three related services personnel whom taught students with special educational needs in an inclusive suburban school district in Ohio.

Participants were assured that the data collected would remain anonymous and confidential. The demographic section of the Survey revealed that there was one related services respondent in each of the following areas: speech and language pathology, occupational therapy, and physical therapy.

The fourteen teacher respondents held special education licensure in the State of Ohio. Of the participants, 82 % ($n=14$) had ten or more years of experience; 11% ($n=2$) had seven-to-nine years of experience; and 5% ($n=1$) had less than three years of experience. For the purposes of this study, all respondents to this survey are referred to as special education service providers.

Setting

A convenient Midwest suburban school district agreed to participate in the study. The participating school district serves 1,725 students in grades PreK-12. The ethnic population of the student body includes Asian (7.6%), African American (3.6%), Caucasian (82.3%), and Multiracial (4.1%) students. Students that are economically disadvantaged represent 5.8% of the population and students with disabilities comprise 8% of the population. As reported on the State's Department of Education's website, this district has been rated as "Excellent" for the past 15 years (ODE, 2015). Table 1 reports the district's performance index and indicators met from the 2013-2014 academic year (ODE, 2015).

The State report card depicts an overall "A" rating of students' attainment of reading and math skills in grades 4-8; however, when each student population is explored, students' value added rates may


be deceiving (See Table 2). When comparing the gifted student population with the students with disabilities, the gifted students' growth gain is greater than the growth standard by at least 2 standard errors. However, the students' with disabilities gain is at most 1 standard error below the growth standard but less than 1 standard error above it. Table 2 illustrates the district's accountability regarding students' attainment of reading and math skills of various student subgroups as well as value added information.

Students' Demographics

Special education service provider participants ($n=17$) were asked to select and review three recent progress report that they prepared and provided to the parents of one of their students. As a result, 51 progress reports were independently reviewed by the participants and the researchers. While the participants were encouraged to complete all sections of the survey; not all participants completed the entire survey which resulted in a slight disparity in the sample size per survey question. According to the participants, the gender of the students' progress reports reviewed were 73% male ($n = 35$) and 27% female ($n = 13$). In addition, the participants identified that 78.7% of the progress reports were from white ($n=37$) and 21.3% were from non-white student ($n = 10$) populations. Figure 1 presents students' ethnicity of the progress reports reviewed.

Figure 1

Student's Ethnicity by Percentage




Response Rate = 92.15%

Results of the survey further revealed that 38.7% ($n=19$) of the progress reports were from children in early childhood programs (grades Pre-k through 3rd grade); 36.8 % ($n = 18$) were from middle school programs (grades 4th through 8th grade); and 24.5% ($n =12$) were from high school programs (grades 9th through 11th). Table 3 presents students' grade level of the progress reports reviewed.

Results of the survey revealed that the progress reports were more frequently from students categorized as Autistic (24.4%) or Other Health Impaired (22.0%) and less frequently categorized as developmentally delayed (2.4%), emotional disturbance (4.9%) and intellectually disabled (4.9%). Figure 2 presents students' exceptionality as reported by the special services provider participants. The survey further revealed that the mean years of experience that special education services providers had was 5.6 (SD = 3.10) for those whose progress reports were reviewed for this study.

Figure 2

Students' Exceptionality by Percentage



Response Rate = 80.39%

Key Elements of Progress Reports

The participating district used a state's IEP Progress Reporting Form (2010) which was designed to provide parents with an account of their child's progress toward meeting IEP goals and objectives. This form included a space for the special education service providers to insert demographic information such as the student's name, identification number, grade level, homeroom teacher's name, special education teacher's name, related service provider's name and building name. In addition, the form included a space for the teacher to insert the child's annual goal, goal number, area and objectives/benchmark. The form utilized a short written response assessment format whereby teachers were requested to briefly report on the student's progress toward meeting IEP's objectives or benchmarks. A comments section was also provided on the form which allowed for a "summary of the measurable data utilized to assess progress and a description of child's progress toward meeting the goal in measurable terms" (IEP Progress Report Form, 2010).

For the purpose of this study, special education service provider participants were asked to select and review three progress reports that they recently sent to their students' parents and to complete the survey. The participants were asked to submit both the progress reports reviewed and the completed survey to the researchers. All identifiable information was redacted from the progress report by the participant prior to submitting the reports to the researchers in order to protect the identity of the students, parents, and all special education service providers.

Progress toward goal. Participants were asked if the progress reports reviewed indicated that the student made progress toward all, some or none of their IEP goal(s). Results of the survey indicated that all of the progress reports ($N = 51$) reviewed by the participants made progress toward meeting some to all of their IEP goal(s). Table 4 presents IEP growth toward meeting goals as documented in the progress reports reviewed.

In addition to identifying growth toward the IEP's goal(s), the participants were asked to identify if the progress reports specified if any IEP goal(s) were met or not met. Participants identified 84% ($n = 37$) of the reports reviewed indicated that the students met some to all of their IEP goals whereas 16% ($n=7$) indicated that IEP goals were not met. Table 5 presents IEP goals met as reported by the participants.

Data to support progress. Participants were asked to identify the types of data reported in the progress report to support their evaluation of the student's progress toward meeting IEP goal(s). Results of the survey unveiled that 75.6% ($n = 31$) of the special education service provider participants used narratives and 61% ($n = 25$) used percentages to substantiate their students' progress toward meeting IEP goals. Survey results also indicated that the participants were less likely to use graphs and charts in the progress reports to validate their students' progress toward meeting their IEP goals. The majority of the participants, 87.8% ($n = 36$) selected more than one data source to support their students' skill attainment either met or made progress toward their IEP goal. Table 6 presents the types of data used to determine progress toward IEP goals.


The participants further indicated that only 8% ($n = 4$) of the progress reports indicated that changes to the instructional strategies were implemented as a result of the student's progress or lack thereof.

The researcher's reviewed the participants' progress monitoring report ($N = 51$) to investigate the types of data reported to the parents. Results of this review showed that 61% ($n = 31$) of the reports used some type of data to support their evaluation of the child's progress. While narratives were included in 23% ($n = 12$) of the reports, they did not include any information to corroborate the participants' evaluation of the child's progress. No comments or narratives were included in 16% ($n = 8$) of the progress reports prepared by the special education service provider participants only.

Data collection. Special education service provider participants were asked the frequency by which they collected data to analyze their student's progress toward meeting IEP goal(s). Results from the survey indicated that 81% ($n = 34$) of the data was collected on a weekly to daily basis and 12% ($n = 5$) on a quarterly basis. Figure 3 presents the frequency of data collection.

Figure 3

Frequency of Data Collection by Percentage



Response Rate = 82.35%

Special education service provider participants were asked to select from a list the individuals who were involved in the data collection of the report they prepared and provided to the parents. Participants who responded to this question indicated that 59.6% of special education teachers ($n = 28$) and 57.5% of ancillary faculty ($n = 27$) were primarily involved in the data collection. The participants further indicated that 36% of educational assistance ($n = 17$) and 12.8% of general education teachers ($n = 6$) were involved in the data collection. Table 7 presents individuals who gathered data on student's progress toward meeting IEP goals.

Progress reports to parents. Special education service provider participants were asked to select the frequency by which they provide information on their student's progress to his/her parents.

Participant respondents ($n=43$) indicated that progress reports were sent home 93% on a quarterly basis ($n=40$), 4.7% on an interim basis ($n=2$) and 2.3% on a weekly basis. ($n=1$).

Study participants were asked to select from a list all of the types of delivery used to inform parents as to their child's progress. The participant respondents most often indicated that 71% of the reports ($n=29$) were sent home with the student. The second most often mode of delivery selected was mailed home to the students' parents 34% ($n=14$). Followed by emailing reports home 29% ($n=12$) to the students' parents. Table 8 presents the manner in which the progress reports delivered to the parents.

While the special education service provider participants used a uniform report, there was not uniformity in the terms or acronyms used to report student's progress. When asked if a key was used to define terms or acronyms to evaluate student's progress, 38% of the participants ($n=19$) indicated that they did provide a key to define terms; whereas 62%, of the teacher participant respondents ($n=31$) indicated that they did not include a key or defined terms. A review of the progress reports by the researchers indicated that a 74.5% ($n=38$) of the progress reports did not define acronyms and terms used in the progress reports.

Participants' Beliefs

Special education service provider participants were asked to rank word pairs that best described their beliefs toward the progress report that they prepared for parents. Using a seven-point Likert-type scale, with one indicating strongly agree and seven indicating strongly disagree. Results of the ranking indicated that the participants' had a positive perception of the reports they prepared for their student's parents. Table 9 presents participants perception of the progress reports they prepared for their student's parents.

Implications for Practice

The purpose of this study was to investigate the status of progress reports and special education service providers' perceptions of the reports that they prepare to keep parents informed about their child's growth toward meeting IEP goals and objectives. The findings of this study suggest that while the special education service providers have a positive view of the reports they prepare, the reports provided to parents lack basic formative information that accounts for their child's progress toward meeting identified IEP goals and objectives. These findings reveal an important dilemma. Although the letter and the spirit of IDEA (2006), encourages a partnership between parents and schools to develop educational plans for students with disabilities and to monitor students' progress in meeting the educational plans, in practice the reports lack clear communication in order to establish this partnership.

According to Vannest, Burke, Payne, Davis, & Soares (2011), "IDEA envisions a public school system fluent in prevention science, data collection, and progress monitoring in order to improve outcomes for students with disabilities" (page 40). As a prevention science, one would expect progress reports to include a summary of the data collected and how it was used to make instructional decisions. However, findings from this study found that data was either absent or not reported in a manner that communicated to parents and other educational team members how instructional decisions were made.

While progress monitoring is a concept that is discussed at IEP meetings and is mandated as a part of a student's educational rights (IDEA, 2006), there is little discussion on the type of data to be collected, how it will be evaluated, and what should be reported to the IEP team. This study found that the majority of the data was collected by educational assistants (46%) and special education teachers (59.6%). When one considers that the majority of students with special needs spend 80% of

their day in the general education classroom, it seems logical that the general education teachers would have a greater role in not only gathering the data but analyzing and reporting students' progress in meeting IEP goals (U.S. National Center for Educational Outcomes, 2014). Federal and state regulations have attempted to address the historically poor educational outcomes reported for students with disabilities resulting in an increase in teachers being held accountable for students' outcomes. While the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education has increased, the graduation rate for students with disabilities continues to lag behind their peers (U.S. National Center for Educational Outcomes, 2014). Perhaps an increase in active engagement of the general education faculty would result in more positive outcomes for students with disabilities. Possibly, the missing link for students' success is the increased role of the general education teacher to not only assist in gathering data but to make instructional decision to increase student learning based upon the results of the data.

This study found that the majority of the participants did use some type of data to support their reporting of students' progress but the majority did not use the data to make instructional decisions. In this study, 41% of the progress reports indicated that the student either met or did not meet the IEP goal. Yet, only 8% of the progress reports indicated any changes were made in instruction. Surely, if a student has met an IEP goal and is still in need of special education services, the IEP team should convene to determine the goal revisions or the development of a new goal. Conversely, if a student is not making progress toward an IEP goal, instructional practices should be adjusted.

IDEA (2004) requires educational teams are required to not only identify goals that focus on the individual needs of a child with disability, but to specify how the child's progress in attaining those goals will be measured and communicated to the parents. This type of progress monitoring

requires that frequent, systematic, and consistent assessments be in place to directly measure both the students' growth in meeting IEP goals and the teaching practices employed to address the skills delineated in the students' IEP goals. Effective communication on a regular basis of the students' progress is paramount to all stakeholders.

A limitation to the study that adversely impacts its generalization was the number of IEP progress reports, the single district involved, and the limited demographics of the district whose documents were examined. Future studies which utilize multiple districts with varying demographics will be explored to further investigate the need for sustained professional development to assist educational team in not only reporting students' progress in attaining IEP goals and objectives but to include parents and students in the process.

The Teacher's Progress Reporting Survey has the potential to heighten teachers' awareness as to the varying aspects of progress monitoring which can assist them in developing progress reports that not only meet federal and state requirements but are meaningful in determining when a teaching practice specifically selected to address the needs of a particular student needs to be adjusted so that students may attain IEP goals. Therefore, teacher training programs and sustained professional development must address the disparities of progress monitoring practices and the role they are to fulfill. Possibly, closing the gap between children with and without disabilities lies within the progress monitoring practices.

References

- Deno, S.L., (2003). Developments in curriculum-based measurement. *The Journal of Special Education*, 37(3), 184-192.
- Etscheidt, S. (2006). Progress Monitoring: Legal Issues and Recommendations for IEP Teams. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 38(3), 56-60.
- Espin, C., Wallace, T., Lembke, E., Campbell, H., and Long, J.D. (2010). Creating a progress monitoring system in reading for middle school students: Tracking progress towards meeting high stakes standards. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 25(2), 60–75.
- Fuchs, L. S., Deno, S., & Mirkin, P. (1984). Effects of frequent curriculum-based measurement and evaluation on pedagogy, student achievement, and student awareness of learning. *American Educational Research Journal*, 21, 449–460.
- Gartin, B. C., & Murdick, N. L. (2005). IDEA 2004: The IEP. *Remedial and Special Education*, 26(6), 327-331.
- Good, R. H., & Jefferson, G. (1998). Contemporary perspectives on Curriculum-Based Measurement validity. In M. R. Shinn (Ed.), *Advanced applications of Curriculum-Based Measurement* (pp. 61-88). New York: Guilford.
- Goodman, J.I., Hazelkorn, M., Bucholz, J.L., Duffy, M.L., & Kitta, Y. (2011). Inclusion and graduation rates: What are the outcomes? *Journal of Disability Policy Studies* 21(4), 241-252.
- <http://reportcard.education.ohio.gov/Pages/District-Search.aspx> retrieved 7/19/2015
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, PL No. 108-446. Retrieved from <http://idea.ed.gov>
- McKenna, M. K., & Good, R., III. (2003). Assessing reading comprehension: The relation between DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency, DIBELS Retell Fluency, and Oregon State
- No Child Left Behind Act (2001). PL 107-110. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html>
- Roach, A. T., Chilungu, N., La Salle, T. P., Talapatra, D., & Vignieri, M. (2009). Opportunities and options for facilitating and evaluating access to the general curriculum for students with disabilities. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 84, 511-528.
- Rosas, C., & Winterman, K.G. (2014). Are parents really partners in their child's education? *Journal of the American Academy of Special Education Professionals (JAASEP)*. Special Education Resource for General Educators (2014). Retrieved from <http://serge.ccsso.org/>

Shinn, M.M., & Shinn, M.R. (2002). Administration and scoring of Reading Curriculum-Based Measurement (R-CBM) for use in general outcome measurement. NCS Pearson, Inc.

U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (2014). Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/>

Vannest, K. J., Burke, M. D., Payne, T. E., Davis, C. R., & Soares, D. A. (2011). Electronic progress monitoring of IEP goals and objectives. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 43, 40-51.

Table 1

Summary information for 2013-2014 State Report Card

Area	Grade Reported	Percentage
Performance Index	Grade A	92.7%
Indicators Met	Grade A	100.0%

Note: A = 90.0 -100.0%;

Table 2

District's Accountability Value-Added Report (2014)

Accountability Measure	Number of Reading Students in the Calculation	Number of Math Students in the Calculation	Mean Gain	Standard Error	Gain Index	Letter Grade
Overall	2244	2235	1.0228	0.1600	6.39	A
2-year	1471	1464	1.3190	0.2169	6.08	A
1-year	725	722	-0.7403	0.3758	-1.96	D
Gifted	716	748	1.1615	0.3110	3.74	A
Lowest 20%		26	4.2552	2.0298	2.10	A
Students with Disabilities	87	86	0.4907	0.9742	0.50	C

Ohio Department of Education (2015)

Table 3

Students' Grade Level by Percentage

Grade	Percentage
Pre-Kindergarten	2.0 (<i>n</i> = 1)
Kindergarten	16.3 (<i>n</i> = 8)
1	4.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)
2	8.2 (<i>n</i> = 4)
3	8.2 (<i>n</i> = 4)
4	4.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)
5	8.2 (<i>n</i> = 4)
6	8.2 (<i>n</i> = 4)
7	8.2 (<i>n</i> = 4)
8	8.2 (<i>n</i> = 4)
9	6.1 (<i>n</i> = 3)
10	8.2 (<i>n</i> = 4)
11	10.2 (<i>n</i> = 5)

Response Rate = 96.07%

Table 4

Growth toward Meeting IEP Goals by Percentage.

Survey Question	Progress Toward All IEP Goals	Progress Toward Some IEP Goals	No Progress
Did your report indicate that your students made progress toward all, some or none of the IEP goal(s)?	61% (<i>n</i> =31)	39% (<i>n</i> =20)	0

Response Rate =100%

Table 5

Progress Reports that indicated IEP Goals were met by Percentage.

Survey Question	Met all Goals	Met Some Goals	Did not Meet Goals
Did your report indicate that the student met all, some or none of the IEP Goal(s)	25% (n=11)	59% (n=26)	16% (n=7)
Response Rate = 86.27%			

Table 6

Types Data Used to Determine Progress toward IEP's Goal(s) by Percentage

Data Type	Percentage
Charts	7.3% (n = 3)
Graphs	4.9% (n = 2)
Narrative	75.6% (n = 31)
Percentage	61.0% (n = 25)
Test Scores	39.0% (n = 16)
Other	31.7% (n = 13)
No data Provided	2.4% (n = 1)
Response Rate = 80.39%	

Note: The variation in sample size is due to the respondents' selection of more than one data source.

Table 7

Individual who are Involved in Progress Monitoring Data Collection

Individuals Who Gather Data	Percentage
Educational Assistant	36.0 (<i>n</i> = 17)
General Education Teacher	12.8 (<i>n</i> = 6)
Interpreter	6.4 (<i>n</i> = 3)
Nurse	6.4 (<i>n</i> = 3)
Occupational Therapist	14.9 (<i>n</i> = 7)
Physical Therapist	8.5 (<i>n</i> = 4)
Special Education Teacher	59.6 (<i>n</i> = 28)
Speech/Language Therapist	21.3 (<i>n</i> = 10)
Response Rate = 92.15%	

Note: The variation in sample size is due to the respondents' selection of more than one data source.

Table 8

Delivery Style of Progress Report to Parents

Mode of Delivery	Percentage
E-Mailed	29.2 (<i>n</i> = 12)
Mailed Home	34.1 (<i>n</i> = 14)
Sent Home with Child	70.7 (<i>n</i> = 29)
Response Rate = 80.39%	

Note: The variation in sample size is due to the respondents' selection of more than one data source.

Table 9

Participants Perception of Progress Reports Prepared

Words	M (SD)
Good	2.27 (0.92)
Worthless	5.55 (1.36)
Important	1.97 (1.31)
Understandable	2.04 (1.02)
Not Helpful	5.61 (1.24)
Effective	2.17 (1.12)
Useful	2.19 (0.94)
n=48	

Likert Type Scale 1(Strongly Agree) – 7(Strongly Disagree)

About the Authors:

Kathleen G. Winterman, Ed.D

Xavier University

3800 Victory Parkway

Cincinnati, Ohio 45207-7311

Wintermank1@xavier.edu

Clarissa Rosas, Ph.D

University of Mt. St. Joseph

5701 Delhi Rd

Cincinnati, Ohio 45233

Clarissa_rosas@msj.edu

Shifting the Paradigm of Identity in Students Who Are Deaf or Hard of Hearing in General Education

Megan Reister, Ph.D.

* Correspondence:

Dr. Megan Reister.
Franciscan University of
Steubenville
Education Department
1235 University Blvd
Steubenville, Ohio 43952
mreister@franciscan.edu
740-284-5297
Full list of author
information is available at
the end of the article

Abstract:

General educators will need to be aware or recognize students with hearing loss may not refer to themselves as deaf in the sense that the general public refers to being deaf by focusing on the variety of perceptions of deafness in the students the general educators may have in their classrooms and how they may help these students advocate for themselves. This manuscript provides an overview of current literature and perspectives from the disciplines of psychology, counseling, and deaf education/deafness of identity as related to hearing loss. The author presents a shifting paradigm through a theoretical model that proposes viewing identity from a different lens, particularly when applied to students with hearing loss who use spoken language and listening and who are educated in general education settings and their caregivers/parents.

INTRODUCTION

Approximately 5% of the general population has significant hearing loss (Woodcock, Rohan, & Campbell, 2007) and approximately three per 1,000 newborns in the United States are born with a hearing loss (K. R. White, 2010; U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2009). Moreover, 95% of children with hearing loss are born to hearing caregivers/parents (Gallaudet Research Institute, 2001; Jackson, Traub, & Turnbull, 2008; National Institute on Deafness, 2013; Woodcock et al., 2007). It is also estimated that 9–10 per 1,000 children will be diagnosed with hearing loss in one or both ears by school age (Sharagorodsky, Curhan, Curhan, & Eavey, 2010; K. R. White, 2010). Within the past decade, fewer children have been classified as having profound hearing losses while the number of children who have been classified as having mild and moderate losses has increased (Moores, 2004). More than 80% of all students with hearing loss in the United States attend their local public schools (Gallaudet Research Institute, 2003/2011).

More recent data from the United States Office of Special Education (U.S. Department of Education, 2012) revealed that 85% of students with hearing loss are educated in public schools. These students are usually the only ones in their classrooms, or even schools, who have hearing loss (Bruce-Rosser, 2009) indicating the importance of general educators in recognizing that students with hearing loss may not refer to themselves as deaf in the sense that the general public refers to being deaf by focusing on the variety of perceptions of deafness in the students the general educators may teach in their classrooms. Through increased understanding of how their students perceive themselves regarding hearing loss, general educators can assist the students with acquisition of self-advocacy skills.

Analyzing how individuals with hearing loss identify themselves with how others in their lives perceive them is critical if understanding and affirmation of one another can occur because caregivers/parents, teachers, and counselors of students with hearing loss must not assume what is most central to individuals with hearing loss. For example, others should realize that individuals with hearing loss may not necessarily identify themselves as being one of the identity types that have been established in identity studies within Deaf Studies/Deafness literature. Instead, caregivers/parents, teachers, and counselors of students with hearing loss must be receptive to how the individual student identifies him or herself (Cole & Edelman, 1991; Jackson et al., 2008; Schlesinger & Meadow, 1972). This awareness of differing perceptions reflects tenets of the Symbolic Interaction Theory in that individuals may hold different interpretations or meanings for the identities they select related to hearing loss.

It is human nature to want to be understood and to view oneself as a whole rather than through isolated features as determined by externally imposed labels and by a singular dimension (i.e., child being seen as more than just as a child having hearing loss but instead being seen as a

creative athletic individual who also has hearing loss (Orrange, 2003). The Multidimensional Identity Model illustrates the desire of wanting to be understood or viewed as a whole, or a sum of multiple parts, rather than solely focusing on one aspect of self. If a disconnect among the individual's perceptions and others' perceptions exists, the differing views of identity must be reconciled before addressing the issues of how to foster self-advocacy in students with hearing loss. Aspects of Social Identity Theory that highlight the concept of belonging or "fitting in" with a group relate to the present study in that, if a student with hearing loss does not perceive him or herself as belonging to a group or as "fitting in", then he or she may feel isolated and unacceptable in terms of his or her social identity membership.

Woodward (1972) first made the distinction between deaf (medical view) and Deaf (cultural view). Those who identify with Deaf culture often communicate through American Sign Language (ASL) and may object to the hearing world and people with hearing loss using the speech mode of communication (Gesser, 2007; Padden & Humphries, 2005; Reagan, 1995; Shakespeare & Watson, 2002). Conversely, if an individual with hearing loss defines him or herself as having a hearing identity type, then the hearing loss would likely be perceived as a medical pathology and the hearing world would be the reference point for normality and health (Ladd, 2005; Padden & Humphries, 2005; Woodward, 1972). In this instance of relating to the hearing world, value is placed on spoken language, therefore those who categorize themselves as having a hearing identity type might call themselves hearing, hard of hearing, or as someone who has hearing loss rather than classifying themselves as having a deaf identity type. In this article, the author will discuss the theoretical model of identity that suggests a shift in the paradigm in regards to identity as related to deafness. General educators may be more familiar with deafness from a Deaf cultural perspective and may want to consider that not every deaf student in his or her classroom may view him or herself from

that perception of identity. However, a person with hearing loss may or may not identify him or herself as deaf from a cultural perspective. Factors such as degree of hearing loss, age of onset, type of hearing loss, family history and lifestyle, mode of communication, and community context influences how an individual with hearing loss perceives or identifies him or herself (Humphries & Humphries, 2011). A person with hearing loss may claim an identity that is radically different from other individuals with a similar type of hearing loss. Many factors contribute to and affect adoption of an individual identity and some researchers agree that identities are constructed within multiple communities and contexts.

This theoretical model of identity of deaf students who utilize spoken language and listening to communicate with others explores perceptions of identity related to hearing loss in conjunction with aspects of the Symbolic Interaction Theory, Social Identity, and the Multidimensional Identity Model in an effort to demonstrate how general educators will need to be aware or recognize students with hearing loss may not refer to themselves as deaf in the sense that the general public refers to what it means to be deaf. This shifting paradigm of deaf identity will better assist general educators by highlighting the need to focus on the variety of perceptions of deafness in the students the general educators may serve and teach in their classrooms. Through a better understanding of how these students might view or perceive themselves in relation to hearing loss, general educators will be better able to assist with increasing self-advocacy within these students and therefore reduce learned helplessness. The overall purposes of the theoretical model are to highlight the importance in discovering how the student with hearing loss identifies him or herself and how others in the student's life perceive the student. If a disconnect exists among those perceptions, the differing views must be reconciled before addressing the issues of self-advocacy and learned helplessness in the student with hearing loss. Additionally, caregivers/parents, general education teachers, and

school counselors can encourage students with hearing loss to consider the less focused on aspects of their identity while still maintaining care to not make assumptions about identity dimensions (i.e., Deaf identity type versus hearing identity type). As Foucault suggests (as cited in Besley & Peters, 2007), by truthfully and authentically confessing who one is to others, we affirm and own our identity. We need to tell the truth about ourselves and we need to uncover the diversity of deaf/Deaf/DeaF epistemologies (Ladd, 2005).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR SHIFTING PARADIGM

To provide a construct for this paradigmatic shift, various researchers have viewed identity from differing perspectives. Simmel (1971) perceived an individual's identity and individuality as being the product of his or her overlapping ethnic, social, religious, familial, geographic, occupational, and multiple other affiliations. Thus, one's self-identity is based on his or her range of multiple intersecting affiliations (Brekhus, 2008; Zerubavel, 2007). Gergen (1991) elaborated on this idea by stating that the modern self is comprised of so many memberships that no single identity membership is likely to comprise a large percentage of a person's overall self. He further posits that authenticity goes beyond assuming that commitment to and pride in one's identity are necessarily the only ways one can claim an authentic identity membership to a marked social category. Constructs of the study of identity from psychology and counseling as well as the literature in Deaf Studies/Deafness served as the foundation for the proposed theoretical model of identity in students with hearing loss who utilize spoken language and listening to communicate. Symbolic Interaction Theory, Social Identity Theory, the Multidimensional Identity Model, and studies of the development of identity from the discipline of Deaf Studies/Deafness were the lens through which the theoretical model of identity was framed. See Figure 1 for a visual representation of the theoretical model of identity.




Figure 1. Theoretical Framework.

One's perception of identity as related to hearing loss may be affected by the meanings he or she attributes to identities, roles, interactions, and contexts (Symbolic Interaction Theory). One's perception of identity as related to hearing loss may also be influenced by how one achieves a sense of belonging to or "fitting in" with a group (Social Identity). In addition, one's perception of identity as related to hearing loss may be contingent upon one's view of self as a whole versus focusing on isolated features that comprise the individual (Multidimensional Identity Model). One's perception of identity as related to hearing loss may also be attributed to his or her interpretation of identity types (Deaf Studies/Deafness literature). It is through social interactions that individuals derive meanings and make sense of their world as described in Symbolic Interaction Theory. These same social interactions also enable individuals to perceive acceptance or non-acceptance in groups as delineated in Social Identity Theory. Further, the Multidimensional Identity Model emphasizes identity as being fluid as demonstrated through the social interactions of individuals with others in

various contexts. Thus, the frameworks of Symbolic Interaction Theory, Social Identity Theory, and Multidimensional Identity Model, in conjunction with the identity types as established within Deaf Studies/Deafness, affirm the role of social interactions in forming perceptions of identity by students with hearing loss and their caregivers/parents.

According to the tenets of the Symbolic Interaction Theory, an individual creates his or her identity through interacting with others so a child's interactions with his or her caregivers/parents have a significant impact in formulating meaning since caregivers/parents are the child's first teachers or first individuals with whom they interact. These interactions influence how the individual behaves in subsequent interactions. If others with whom an individual interacts disagree with the individual's self-identity or perceptions of hearing loss, this may lead to an individual questioning his or her identity or how he or she defines hearing loss. The Symbolic Interaction Theory views the family as a seminal social interaction group and posits that individuals develop both a concept of self and their identities through social interaction with family members (Burgess, 1925; Handel, 1985). Family members are the first individuals with whom a child interacts, thus, families serve as shapers of identity since they are crucial sites of creating and verifying social and shared meanings.

In addition to Symbolic Interaction Theory, Social Identity Theory delineates the relationship between the individual and society and the development of an individual's personal and social identities (C. A. Baker, 2012; Mead, 1934; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Social identity is defined as the "aspects of an individual's self-image that derive from the social categories to which he perceives himself as "belonging" (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Therefore, an individual's social identity refers to that part of one's sense of identity that emerges from his or her belonging to a particular group and thus, acts as a locus of interaction between personal and group identity. For example, a

caregiver/parent may perceive his or her daughter with hearing loss as belonging to a separate group of individuals who are similar to her, with respect to hearing loss, or the caregiver/parent may identify his or her child as being hearing and “fitting in” with peers who do not have hearing loss.

CURRENT PARADIGM OF IDENTITY MODELS OF DEAFNESS/HEARING LOSS

Four identity types (a) Deaf, (b) deaf, (c) marginal, and (d) bicultural/dual have commonly been discussed in the Deaf Studies/Deafness literature (Cornell & Lyness, 2004; Glickman & Carey, 1993; Lane, Hoffmeister, & Bahan, 1996; Most, Wiesel, & Blitzer, 2007; Woodward, 1972).

Deaf. Those individuals who identify themselves as Deaf tend to participate in social activities within Deaf culture/community, communicate through American Sign Language (ASL), and may object to the hearing world and using speech due to not viewing themselves as having a disability nor needing to conform to the hearing society (Gesser, 2007; Padden & Humphries, 2005; Reagan, 1995; Shakespeare & Watson, 2002). When used as a cultural label, the word, deaf, is written with a capital D, and refers to an individual with hearing loss who uses ASL as his or her primary mode of communication as being “big D Deaf.”

deaf. The word, deaf, written with a lower case d, is used to describe the medical pathology of an individual having hearing loss (Ladd, 2005; Padden & Humphries, 2005; Woodward, 1972). In contrast to the Deaf identity type (Cornell & Lyness, 2004; Glickman & Carey, 1993; Lane et al., 1996; Most et al., 2007; Woodward, 1972), individuals who identify themselves as deaf may perceive deafness as a medical pathology or a disability and use the hearing world as their reference point for normality and health with value being placed on use of spoken language (Beart, 2005; Berkay, Gardner, & Smith, 1995; Ladd, 2005; Woodward, 1972). The medical view of deafness purports that the pathological absence of hearing is a disability that should be aided through medical

procedures or listening technology, such as the use of cochlear implants or hearing aids, and other medical interventions (e.g., surgery) to improve hearing and ameliorate the loss of hearing.

Marginal. Individuals who are members of the marginal identity type do not feel a sense of belonging with the Deaf culture/community nor do they believe they are able to operate within the hearing world (i.e., deaf identity type; Glickman, 1986; Most et al., 2007). These individuals may experience difficulties in both “worlds” as a result of deficient social and communication skills (Most et al., 2007; Woodward, 1972).

Bicultural/dual. Individuals who identify themselves as the bicultural/dual identity type are able to navigate both the Deaf and hearing worlds hence the duality of the identity type. Members of the bicultural/dual identity type tend to use both signed and spoken languages to communicate with others. Bicultural identity is reserved for those who feel comfortable in both worlds by belonging to the Deaf culture/community but also feeling comfortable with and respecting hearing people which correlates with the Multidimensional Identity Model in that these individuals have various attributes to their identity.

Hard of hearing. A fifth identity type has also emerged within the Deafness/Deaf Studies literature. Individuals with hearing loss who choose to identify themselves as having a hearing identity by being able to function within hearing society may claim to be hard of hearing rather than deaf (Leigh, 2009). This hard of hearing category is not necessarily related to individuals’ degrees of hearing loss and is largely based on self-identification (Grushkin, 2003). Some individuals who are hard of hearing also describe themselves as living “between worlds,” in conjunction with Brueggeman’s (2009) concept of “inbetweenity,” because they are neither fully deaf nor fully hearing. This notion correlates with Social Identity Theory in that members of a group can only feel they fit in if they achieve a sense of belonging through interactions with others. Grushkin’s (2003)

findings indicate that rather than identifying as the marginal identity type, these individuals prefer to be in a separate and fifth identity group, the hard of hearing identity type. Thus, the hard of hearing identity type acknowledges the difficulty in determining the boundaries between deaf and hard of hearing and indicates these boundaries vary along audiological, cultural, and ideological perspectives.

SHIFTING THE PARADIGM TO FORM THEORETICAL MODEL

The author's perspective of the need for a shifting paradigm regarding identity and deafness is supported by the review of the literature presented in this article. Further, the concept of identity being fluid and multi-faceted, based upon contexts and interactions with others, as posited in the Symbolic Interaction Theory (Mead, 1934), can be applied to how the terms Deaf and deaf contradict, overlap, coexist, and compete with one another (Skelton & Valentine, 2003). The author suggests moving away from the binary constructs of deaf/hearing or Deaf/deaf in order to capture the full experiences of living with hearing loss. Fernandes and Myers (2010) affirm this perspective in that constructs of deafness need to expand beyond two rigid opposites (binary model of sign versus speech) and accept the complexities involved in identity formation to better understand that individuals with hearing loss have found new identities among the fixed terms (Corker, 1996; Leigh, 2009; Wrigley, 1996). The notion that deaf identity is *not* a static concept but a complex, fluid, ongoing search for belonging is a novel paradigm that departs from the binary mode of thinking (e.g., classifying an individual as deaf or Deaf) which reflects aspects of the Multidimensional Identity Model.

Fernandes' and Myers's expanded perspective of the deaf identity type was affirmed in an ethnographic study by McIlroy and Storbeck (2011) in which results suggested that expanding perceptions of the deaf identity type beyond the binary medical (i.e., deaf identity type) and social

(i.e., Deaf identity type) conceptualizations of identity creates a postmodern bicultural “dialogue model” that can be a useful framework in examining the diversity of identities of individuals with hearing loss (McIlroy & Storbeck, 2011). McIlroy and Storbeck define DeaF identity as the cultural space from which individuals with hearing loss transition within and between both the Deaf community and the hearing community thereby encompassing a fluid view of identity in that individuals can move from one identity type to another as they choose depending on the roles, interactions, and contexts or settings in which the individual engages. The capital F highlights the individual’s fluid interactions with his or her typically hearing family members whereas during social interactions with peers who have hearing loss who use ASL, the individual is able to fluidly connect and identify with members of the Deaf community/culture which results in a cross-cultural bicultural dialogue between sign language and a spoken or written language (McIlroy, 2010).

For all individuals, regardless of whether or not hearing loss exists, identity changes across an individual’s developmental trajectory. For example, an individual may identify as being deaf during the elementary school years but may identify as being Deaf during high school due to differences in his/her social and educational experiences and interactions. In addition to the primacy of caregivers/parents, family, language, and education are also influential to the identity development of children (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). However, the additional presence of hearing loss adds unique pressures to these experiences. Thus, children’s family and school experiences help form identity due to the socially constructed process based on past and present experiences (McIlroy & Storbeck, 2011).

Multiple perspectives of identity development from the disciplines of psychology, counseling, and Deaf Studies/Deafness are blended into a theoretical framework that led to the current theoretical model of identity as related to deafness. See Figure 2 for a visual representation

of the theoretical model based upon the literature review. In the theoretical model, identity is viewed as being fluid and constantly changing depending upon an individual's social interactions with others, life experiences, and the setting or context of the individual.




Figure 2. Theoretical Model.

At the perimeter of the theoretical model, the outer wavy lines represent identity as being fluid and constantly changing depending upon an individual's social interactions with others, life experiences, and the setting or context of the individual. The solid arrows display that identity is viewed as cyclical in nature in its evolving processes that continue to expand as the individual discovers and learns more about him or herself. At the center of the model, a spiral depicts the

student's identity as being shaped by the critical influence of caregivers/parents on the development of an individual's identity. The lines of the spiral can vary in thickness to illustrate that the influence of others (in this study the caregivers/parents), can be of greater or lesser influence depending upon timing and circumstances within the individual's world. As shown in the figure of the theoretical model, an individual's identity is portrayed as an ever changing multi-faceted process.

The literature related to identity development within Deaf Studies/Deafness posits that identity is contextual and dynamic which is in agreement with elements of Symbolic Interaction Theory and Social Identity Theory. Additionally, identity may change across an individual's developmental trajectory as the individual encounters new and different educational experiences and interactions. Interactions with others affect how an individual sees him or herself and attempts to fit in or belong to a group which speaks to Social Identity Theory where importance is placed on the individual's ability to belong or fit in with a group, whatever that group may be (Burke, 2004). Conversely, interactions with the individual with hearing loss also affect how others perceive that individual and hearing loss. These interactions affect the meanings individuals construct for interactions as posited in Symbolic Interaction Theory (Blumer, 1969; Brekhus, 2008; Burke, 2004; Cooley, 1902; Hays, 1977; Mead, 1934). In the past, literature within Deaf Studies/Deafness that related to identity argued that individuals with hearing loss would fit into one of four identity types: Deaf, deaf, dual/bicultural, or marginalized (Most et al., 2007, Woodward, 1972). However, in recent years, a shift has occurred within the literature in Deaf Studies/Deafness toward aspects of the Multidimensional Identity Model in which identity is seen as being fluid and not static while other categories of identity within deafness have emerged (e.g., hard of hearing, hearing, DeaF; Brekhus, 2008; Grushkin, 2003; McIlroy & Storbeck, 2011) which departs from the binary model of categorizing individuals with hearing loss as Deaf (cultural or social view) or deaf (medical view)

and points to the present theoretical model of identity in shifting the paradigm in how identity related to deafness is viewed.

CONCLUSION

Although the research described in this literature review that led to the present proposed theoretical model of identity in Figure 2 represents an awareness of constructs of identity within Deaf Studies/Deafness, the focus on fluidity or “in betweenity” among identity types has not been explored with the growing population of students with hearing loss who utilize spoken language and listening as their primary mode of communication (Brueggemann, 2009). Through the present literature review, one can hope the sharing of this information with general educators will contribute to the understanding of how human behavior and experience empower others (Creswell, 2007). Moreover, the present literature review is exploratory in nature as the author attempts to focus on a new angle within a topic that has been sparsely investigated (Lichtman, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 1998) due to the low-incidence nature of hearing loss.

Analyzing how students with hearing loss identify themselves with how others in their lives perceive themselves is critical if understanding and affirming of one another can occur because others must not assume what is most central to individuals with hearing loss. Instead, others must be receptive to how the student identifies him or herself (Cole & Edelman, 1991; Jackson et al., 2008; Schlesinger & Meadow, 1972). Becoming aware of one’s D/deafness does not necessarily lead to a deaf identity per se; rather it leads to a realization of one’s own personal identity, whatever that may be (Mottez, 1990). In addition to a better understanding of deaf individuals and whether or not they identify with various aspects of deafness by general educators, larger critical justice issues related to deafness have important implications influencing the types of knowledge and identities produced not just for students who are deaf, but for a greater understanding of humankind and our connections to

the world (Horejes, 2010). One would do well to remember that there is more that unites individuals than divides them (Pray & Jordan, 2010).

REFERENCES

- Baker, C. A. (2012). Social identity theory and biblical interpretation. *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 42, 129–138. doi:10.1177/0146107912452244
- Beart, S. (2005). 'I won't think of myself as a learning disability. But I have': Social identity and self-advocacy. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 33, 128–131.
- Berkay, P. J., Gardner, J. E., & Smith, P. L. (1995). A scale for assessing hearing adults' beliefs about the capabilities of deaf adults. *Journal of the American Deafness and Rehabilitation Association*, 29, 33–44.
- Besley, T., & Peters, M. (2007). *Subjectivity and truth: Foucault, education and the culture of the self*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Brekhus, W. H. (2008). Trends in the Qualitative Study of Social Identities. *Sociology Compass*, 2, 1059–1078.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bruce-Rosser, K. (2009, January 12). Circle supports deaf girls. *Stonnington Leader*, p. 13. Retrieved from <http://www.deafchildrenaustralia.org.au/sites/deafchildrenaustralia.org.au/files/Circle%20Supports%20deaf%20teengirls.pdf>
- Brueggemann, B. J. (2009). *Deaf subjects: Between identities and places*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Burgess, E. W. (1925). The growth of the city: An introduction to a research project. In R. Park, E. Burgess, & R. McKenzie (Eds.), *The city* (pp. 47–62). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Burke, P. J. (2004). Identities and social structure: The 2003 Cooley-Mead award address. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 67, 5–15.
- Cole, S. H., & Edelmann, R. J. (1991). Identity patterns and self- and teacher-perceptions of problems for deaf adolescents: A research note. *Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry & Allied Disciplines*, 32, 1159–1165.
- Cooley, C. H. (1902). *Human Nature and the Social Order*. New York, NY: Scribner.
- Corker, M. (1996). *Counseling—The deaf challenge*. London, England: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

- Cornell, S. L., & Lyness, K. P. (2004). Therapeutic implications for adolescent deaf identity and self-concept. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy: An International Forum*, 16(3), 31–49.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dalton, C. J. (2011). Social-emotional challenges experienced by students who function with mild and moderate hearing loss in educational settings. *Exceptionality Education International*, 21(1), 28–45.
- Fernandes, J., & Myers, S. (2010). Inclusive deaf studies: Barriers and pathways. *Journal of Deaf Studies & Deaf Education*, 15, 3–16. doi:10.1093/deafed/enp018
- Gallaudet Research Institute. (2001, January). *Regional and national summary report of data from the 1999–2000 Annual Survey of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Children & Youth*. Washington, DC: Author, Gallaudet University.
- Gallaudet Research Institute. (2003, December). *Regional and national summary report of data from the 2002–2003 annual survey of deaf and hard of hearing children and youth*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University.
- Gallaudet Research Institute. (2011, April). *Regional and national summary report of data from the 2009–2010 annual survey of deaf and hard of hearing children and youth*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University.
- Gergen, K. J. (1991). *The saturated self: Dilemmas of identity in contemporary life*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Gesser, A. (2007). Learning about hearing people in the land of the deaf: An ethnographic account. *Sign Language Studies*, 7, 269–283.
- Glickman, N. S. (1986). Cultural identity, deafness, and mental health. *Journal of Rehabilitation of the Deaf*, 20, 1–10.
- Glickman, N. S., & Carey, J. C. (1993). Measuring deaf cultural identities: A preliminary investigation. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 38, 275–283.
- Grushkin, D. A. (2003). The dilemma of the hard of hearing within the U.S. deaf community. In L. Monaghan, C. Schmaling, K. Nakamura, & G. H. Turner (Eds.), *Many ways to be deaf: International variation in deaf communities* (pp. 114–140). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Handel, G. (1985). *The psychosocial interior of the family* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

- Hays, W. C. (1977). Theories and theoretical frameworks identified by family sociologists. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 39, 59–65.
- Horejcs, T. P. (2010). Constructions of deafness and deaf education: Exploring normalcy and deviance. *US, ProQuest Information & Learning*, 71.
- Humphries, T., & Humphries, J. (2011). Deaf in the time of the cochlea. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 16(2), 153–163.
- Jackson, C. W., Traub, R. J., & Turnbull, A. P. (2008). Parents' experiences with childhood deafness: Implications for family-centered services. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 29, 82–98.
- Ladd, P. (2005). *Understanding deaf culture: In search of deafhood*. Cleveland, OH: Multilingual Matters.
- Lane, H., Hoffmeister, R., & Bahan, B. (1996). *A journey into the Deaf-World*. San Diego, CA: DawnSignPress.
- Leigh, I. W. (2009). *A lens on deaf identities: Perspectives on deafness*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lichtman, M. (2006). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McIlroy, G. (2010). *Discovering deaf identities: A narrative exploration of educational experiences on deaf identity*. Saarbrücken, Germany: Lambert Academic Publishers.
- McIlroy, G., & Storbeck, C. (2011). Development of deaf identity: An ethnographic study. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 16, 494–511.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self & society from the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Moore, D. (2004). The future of education of deaf children: Implications of population projections. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 149, 3–4.
- Most, T., Wiesel, A., & Blitzer, T. (2007). Identity and attitudes towards cochlear implant among deaf and hard of hearing adolescents. *Deafness & Education International*, 9, 68–82.
- Mottez, B. (1990). Deaf identity. *Sign Language Studies*, 68, 195–216.
- National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders. (2013). *Quick statistics*. Retrieved from <http://www.nidcd.nih.gov/health/statistics/Pages/quick.aspx>

- Orrange, R. M. (2003). The emerging mutable self: Gender dynamics and creative adaptations in defining work, family, and the future. *Social Forces*, 82, 1–34.
- Padden, C. A., & Humphries, T. (2005). *Inside deaf culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pray, J. L., & Jordan, I. K. (2010). The deaf community and culture at a crossroads: Issues and challenges. *Journal of Social Work in Disability & Rehabilitation*, 9, 168–193.
- Reagan, T. (1995). A sociocultural understanding of deafness: American Sign Language and the culture of deaf people. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 19, 239–251.
- Schlesinger, H. S., & Meadow, K. P. (1972). *Sound and sign: Childhood deafness and mental health*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Shakespeare, T., & Watson, N. (2002). The social model of disability: An outdated ideology? *Research in Social Science*, 2, 9–28.
- Sharagorodsky, J., Curhan, S. G., Curhan, G. C., & Eavey, R. (2010). Change in prevalence of hearing loss in US adolescents. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 304, 772–778.
- Simmel, G. (1971). *On individuality and social forms*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
- Skelton, T., & Valentine, G. (2003). It feels like being deaf is normal: An exploration into the complexities of defining D/deafness and young D/deaf people's identities. *Canadian Geographer*, 47, 451–466.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relation* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2009). Summary of 2008 National CDC EHDI Data, Version A. Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/ncbddd/hearingloss/2009-Data/2009_EHDI_HSFS_Summary_508_OK.pdf
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2011* (NCES 2012-001), Chapter 2.
- White, K. R. (October, 2010). *Twenty years of early hearing detection and intervention (EHDI): Where we've been and what we've learned*. ASHA Audiology Virtual Conference.
- Woodcock, K., Rohan, M. J., & Campbell, L. (2007). Equitable representation of deaf people in mainstream academia: Why not? *Higher Education*, 53, 359–379.

- Woodward, J. C. (1972). Implications for sociolinguistic research among the deaf. *Sign Language Studies*, 1, 1–7.
- Wrigley, O. (1996). *The politics of deafness*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Zerubavel, E. (2007). Generally speaking: The logic and mechanics of social pattern analysis. *Sociological Forum*, 22, 131–145.

About the Author:

Dr. Megan Reister,
Franciscan University of Steubenville,
Education Department,
1235 University Blvd., Steubenville, Ohio 43952.
Email: mreister@franciscan.edu
Business phone: 740-284-5297

Assistant Professor in Education Department at Franciscan University of Steubenville- responsible for teaching undergraduate reading, early intervention, and inclusive education courses within the Education Department, advising and mentoring students, and collaborating with other faculty and departments on campus. Dr. Reister has taught school aged children in special and deaf education in Delaware, Pennsylvania, and North Carolina and enjoys presenting research at regional and national conferences. Most recently she is getting to know her new home state of Ohio with her husband and their two puppies when not teaching at FUS.

Fostering Leadership in Early Childhood Teacher Candidates: Case Studies from Three Ohio Universities

Pam Owen, Ed.D., Mary Barbara Trube, Ed.D., Krishana White, Ph.D., and Laurie Katz, Ph.D.

* Correspondence:

Dr. Pam Owen.
Mount Vernon Nazarene
University
800 Martinsburg Rd
Mount Vernon, Ohio 43050
Pam.owen@mvnu.edu
740-501-5831
Full list of author
information is available at
the end of the article

Abstract:

Four early childhood teacher educators used the case study methodology to discuss strategies and practices to develop pre-service teacher leaders during teacher preparation programs at three Ohio universities. The strategies used are grounded in the work accomplished by The Teacher Leadership Exploratory Consortium, specifically the Teacher Leader Model Standards (TLMS).

The TLMS outline high, demanding, but reasonable expectations for teachers; they are cross-walked with a variety of specialized professional associations (SPAs). Our early childhood case study strategies can be modified to be effective in multiple licensure areas.

INTRODUCTION

Four early childhood teacher educators used the case study methodology to discuss strategies and practices to develop pre-service teacher leaders in teacher preparation programs at three Ohio universities. It is our hope that the examples of integrating the Teacher Leadership Model Standards (TLMS) will create awareness of these standards and promote capacities for building leadership skills (knowledge, skills, sense of self) in future teacher leaders. The strategies used in these case studies are grounded in the work accomplished by The Teacher Leadership Exploratory Consortium, specifically the Teacher Leader Model Standards (TLMS). The TLMS were designed for the purpose of promoting teacher leadership and dialogue (see Table 1).

Table 1 Teacher Leader Model Standards

DOMAIN I: Fostering A Collaborative Culture To Support Educator Development And Student Learning
DOMAIN II: Accessing And Using Research To Improve Practice And Student Learning
DOMAIN III: Promoting Professional Learning For Continuous Improvement
DOMAIN IV: Facilitating Improvements In Instruction And Student Learning
DOMAIN V: Promoting The Use Of Assessments And Data For School And District Improvement
DOMAIN VI: Improving Outreach And Collaboration With Families And Community
DOMAIN VII: Advocating For Student Learning And The Profession

In 2008, individuals from five states, including Ohio, formed the Teacher Leadership Exploratory Consortium. This work resulted in the creation of the TLMS as their expression of the importance of fostering teacher leaders. We believe these standards can be used to promote leadership skills in the university programs of education among pre-service teachers; it is important for teacher educators to be intentional about planning strategies and practices promoting pre-service teachers' leadership skills during their preparation. The Teacher Leadership Exploratory Consortium defined teacher leadership as "the process by which teachers influence their colleagues, principals, and other members of the school community to improve teaching and learning practices with the aim of increased student learning and achievement" (TLEC, p. 10). Pre-service teachers can begin this process of influence.

This is an important skill set as many institutions for teacher preparation (e.g. universities, school districts, agencies) move toward the clinical model with strong partnerships to create professional learning communities. The TLMS outline high, demanding, but reasonable expectations for teachers; they are literally cross-walked with a variety of specialized professional associations (SPAs). Our early childhood case study strategies can be modified to be effective in multiple licensure areas.

Mount Vernon Nazarene University*Becoming a Teacher Leader through Journaling*

My work begins when the candidates are sophomores in a field experience known as the Preschool Field. This field is a three-hour block of time once a week for 15 weeks in the preschool classroom. The TLMS have given me a lens with which to view teacher leadership and show that picture to my candidates. The candidates have five journal entries to write after they observe the preschool as an entire and complete community involving the parents, children, teacher, and environment. These observations are based in the five guidelines of developmentally appropriate practice: creating a caring community of learners, teaching to enhance development and learning, planning curriculum to achieve important goals, assessing children's development and learning, and establishing reciprocal relationships with families. The candidates observe and answer open-ended questions about one of the guidelines each week. Domain III of the TLMS states that, "the teacher leader understands the evolving nature of teaching and learning, established and emerging technologies, and the school community. The teacher leader uses this knowledge to promote, design, and facilitate job-embedded professional learning aligned with school improvement goals" (TLMS, p. 43). Candidates must first know what this nature involves before they can understand it, thus the observations and journal entries. The observations and journal entries also "facilitate professional learning among colleagues," (Domain IIIc). The journal entries are read by the university supervisor, the cooperating teacher, and the preschool classroom instructor. Feedback is given to the candidate by the university supervisor and the classroom teacher is aware of the interaction. This triangulation promotes learning and creates a teaching team. It provides the foundation for further collaborative planning in the field.

Becoming a Teacher Leader through Collaborative Planning and Teaching

Candidates use this emerging understanding of the nature of teaching and learning to begin their work designing team-based curriculum (university supervisor, cooperating teacher, preschool classroom teacher, and peers) that is aligned with the Ohio Early Learning Standards and the specific school goals (Domain IIIa). The procedures ultimately lead to meeting Domain IIIe, to “work with colleagues to collect, analyze, and disseminate data related to the quality of professional learning and its effect on teaching and student learning” (TLMS, p. 43). Briefly, the collaborative process is a series of steps: 1) the candidate consults with the classroom teacher about the topic and standard, 2) the candidate writes a lesson plan, 3) the candidate meets with the cooperating teacher to discuss the plan using the lens of DAP and other research about teaching and learning, making any necessary changes to the plan, 4) the lesson is taught, 5) the candidate evaluates the teaching and learning that takes place and writes a formal reflection that includes strengths in the teaching practice and identifying what needs to be improved to enhance student learning, and finally, 6) the cooperating teacher provides constructive feedback. This cycle also meets Domain IIIg, “provides constructive feedback to colleagues to strengthen teaching practice and improve student learning.”

The preschool field, as a whole meets Domain IV. This model could be used by candidates once they are licensed and in employment. When the candidates learn to value this process this practice will more naturally flow from them and hopefully they will more easily transition into a role of teacher leader, as is suggested by the Teacher Leadership Exploratory Consortium.

Becoming a Teacher Leader through Online Learning Modules

I examined the TLMS through the lens of creating teachers who are leaders in the online learning environment. My senior level content literacy course traditionally required two candidate-led presentations. However, my end of course surveys indicated that several students found the dual

presentation requirement redundant. My course has a firm root in Constructivism, because I feel strongly that our teacher candidates need to be equipped to go out into the teaching field able to construct knowledge and disseminate information important to their ongoing growth and development of practice. But how could I keep both presentations and still gain buy-in from my audience? That is when I began toying with the idea of having students create online learning modules to replace one of the face-to-face presentations required in my senior level content literacy course.

Dalton (2014) emphasizes the importance for both teachers and students to be not just proficient communicators in the online teaching and learning environment, but to see themselves as multimodal creators; for online teaching and learning requires consideration of one's targeted audience through the intentional choice of text, fonts, images, audio visuals, and other media outlets. Additionally, since many schools are moving toward online learning management systems like Moodle for posting homework and other such relevant course material, the importance for teacher candidates to grow their comfort and familiarity with teaching in the online environment becomes imperative for teaching in the 21st century (Murray, 2011). Even at the early childhood level, there is an increasing expectation that teachers replace the traditional "blizzard bag" with a high-quality online learning experience during calamity days.

TLMS Domains 1-4 fit very closely with my vision for they promote collaboration to improve student learning and teacher development and research for the improvement of practice on an ongoing basis with the ultimate goal of improving instruction for student learning. Each of these standards blends with the intended goals and outcomes of having students create online learning modules for the professional growth and development of their peers. This is a skill that makes candidates more attractive during interviews as many districts are looking to resident experts to

create ongoing, cost-efficient professional development for their teaching staff and convey engaging lessons via the online learning environment.

Ohio University

Becoming a Teacher Leader through Peer-Mentoring

Teacher leaders assume formal and informal roles (Harrison & Killion, 2007, p. 37) and follow multiple pathways to support their colleagues. Mentoring, one of ten roles of teacher leaders, is defined as follows:

Mentoring is a developmental relationship in which a more experienced or more knowledgeable teacher helps a less experienced or less knowledgeable teacher develop the skills to be effective in the classroom, develop the ability to be reflective about his or her teaching, and become an active member of the school community. (TLEC, p. 76).

Serving as a mentor for novice teachers is a common role for teacher leaders in Ohio's schools; as is mentoring pre-service early childhood teacher candidates. Mentors make significant contributions to the development of a new professional or developing teacher candidate by serving as role models, acclimating newly hired teachers or interns to the school, and by advising new teachers or interns about instruction, assessment, curriculum, procedure, practices, and district and/or campus policies.

Mentoring in teacher preparation is described as a relationship journey built on "trust, the sharing of expertise, moral support, and knowing when to help and when to sit back" (Awaya, McEwan, Heyler, Linsky, Lum & Wakukawa, 2003, p. 45). The process of engaging teacher candidates in mentoring and being mentored promotes reflective practice, an essential core practice for pre-service and in-service teacher development (Sundli, 2006). Issues facing teacher educators include rigorous preparation in content, content pedagogy, assessment, technology and core practices (Cochran, King, & DeRuiter, 1991). These issues are addressed through peer-mentoring in

clinically-based programs of teacher preparation for traditional and nontraditional teacher candidates (Gut & Beam, 2014).

From 2014 through 2015, an exploratory study investigating the benefits of peer mentoring for early childhood education students enrolled in a junior English-equivalency course, ECE methods' courses, and an 80-hour clinical-field placement was conducted. Following a 3-hour training on mentoring, thirty-three [33 traditional (42%) and non-traditional (58%)] early childhood teacher candidates engaged in peer-mentoring for fourteen weeks. Questions or prompts required participants to list qualities demonstrated by peer mentors; list their own strengths; and list ways peer mentoring was beneficial to them in their preparation program.

Peer mentors identified their strengths in aspects of ethical and professional behaviors when mentoring others in the following ways: 33 (100%) listed "respectfulness" 29 (88%) listed "trustworthiness," "understanding," and "remaining positive," 28 (85%) listed

"appropriateness," 25 (76%) listed "responsiveness," and 21 (64%) listed "maintaining focus."

While commenting on their peer-mentors, teacher candidates included the following: 33 (100%) listed "kindness," 31 (94%) listed "leadership," 30 (91%) listed "honesty," 29 (88%) listed "patience" and "respectfulness," 28 (85%) listed "ability to be critical," 27 (82%) listed "taught me new information and skills," 26 (79%) listed "skill at editing," "cared enough to be accurate," 25 (76%) listed "generosity with his/her time," and 21 (64%) listed "persistence."

Teacher candidates have the opportunity to engage in informal and formal leadership roles to build the success of their peers while having their own knowledge, skills and understandings enhanced through peer mentoring. They are able to experience collegial relationships built on

“trust, the sharing of expertise, moral support, and knowing when to help and when to sit back” (Awaya et al, p. 45).

Based on the data and concepts mentioned above, faculty and student services administrators at Ohio University have established formal and informal avenues for peer mentoring. The benefits of all forms of mentoring are well established in the literature for both traditional and non-traditional university students (Cohen, 1995; LeCornu, 2005; Wyatt, 2011). A rationale I suggest for promoting peer-mentoring during early childhood teacher preparation is the goal of fostering a climate of mentoring. Involving teacher candidates in the processes and practices of mentoring develop the knowledge, skills, dispositions, and sense-of-self that teacher leaders need to be effective.

The Ohio State University

Becoming a Teacher Leader through Inquiry-Based Learning

Part of the Master of Arts (MA) Program in Early Childhood Education at the Ohio State University has involved students completing a capstone (i.e., culminating) project, designed by the department faculty or a topic from the coursework individually developed under the advisor’s direction. These projects are often in the form of a research paper and presented to the advisor and second reader for a passing grade. As an advisor and teacher educator in this MA Program, I have been redesigning the capstone project to incorporate Inquiry-based learning that aligns with the Teacher Leadership Model Standards (TLMS) that I describe in this section.

An inquiry-based approach is primarily a pedagogical method, developed during the discovery learning movement of the 1960s as a response to traditional forms of learning; e.g., through memorizing and finding the correct answer. The philosophy of inquiry based learning developed from constructivist learning theories, building on work of Piaget and Inhekder (1969), Dewey (1933), and Vygotsky (1980), among others. Some of the inquiry-based characteristics

include posing questions, making observations, conducting research to obtain supporting evidence for their questions. Benefits of this approach include constructing one's own knowledge and becoming critical thinkers and problem solvers and enhanced self-efficacy, confidence and independence (Malone, 2008).

Becoming A Teacher Leader through Conference Presentations

In the latter half of their program, the students develop an inquiry question that will become the focus of their capstone project. The idea of having them develop an inquiry question in the middle of their program gives them an opportunity to further explore concepts, theories, and/or practices that have been presented in their courses. The final product of the capstone takes the form of a poster that is presented at the Ohio Association for the Education of Young Children's Conference (OAEYC). In order to present their poster, the student develops a proposal of their project to be accepted by the OAEYC program staff. Following are two examples from these inquiry-based projects. During the MA program students learn about the importance of addressing children from all cultural and linguistic backgrounds within the curriculum. One student, an assistant preschool teacher, explored this topic more in depth by posing the following question: How do I incorporate multicultural literature in my preschool classroom? She conducted a set of activities to explore her question, e.g., collected information about selecting authentic multicultural literature and strategies to implement this literature into a preschool curriculum. In the second example, a student had been introduced to promoting young children's literacy development using pop-culture through the Literacy Playshop Model (Wohlwend, 2013). This student took her cultural knowledge of Monkey King, a prototype of a Chinese folktale, (Wu, 1980) and posed the following question: How do I incorporate the pop-culture figure of Monkey King using the Literacy Playshop Model into the preschool curriculum? Reviewing the TLMS, these students developed leadership skills particularly

associated with Domain III – Promoting professional Learning for Continuous Improvement.

Developing an inquiry based project in the form of a poster that the MA student explains to their conference audience is an example of the teacher leader being able to use synthesize and use this information to promote, design, and facilitate professional learning of other early childhood educators that aligns with curricular early childhood goals.

Conclusion

It is understood that these are beginning teachers who are barely connecting to their profession. However, these strategies are effective in enhancing teacher leadership behaviors among our candidates. Our desire to promote teacher leadership could be strengthened by making direct connection to the TLMS within the assignments. More discussion about teacher leadership would also help the candidates make stronger connections to their profession and practice thus improving their focus regarding their professional vision. In light of the TLMS it is evident that these practices can be implemented and strengthened.

References

- Awaya, A., McEwan, H., Heyler, D., Linsky, S., Lum, D., Wakukawa, P. (2003). *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19(1), 45-56.
- Cochran, K. F., King, R. A., & DeRuiter, J. A. (1991). Pedagogical content knowledge: A tentative model for teacher preparation. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Research Association, April, 1991, Chicago.
- Cohen, N. H. (1995). *Mentoring adult learners: A guide for educators and trainers (Professional practices in adult education and human resource development)*. Malabar, FL: Kreiger.
- Dalton, B. (2012). Multimodal composition and the common core state standards. *Reading Teacher*, 66(4), 333–339. DOI:10.1002/TRTR.01129
- Dalton, B. (2014). Multimodal composition and the common core state standards. *Reading Teacher*, 66(4), 333–339. DOI:10.1002/TRTR.01129
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educational process*. Lexington, MA: Heath.
- Gut, D., & Beam, P. (2014). Peer coaching in a co-teaching mentoring model. In A. Howley & B. Trube (Eds.). *Mentoring for the professions: Orienting toward the future*, Information Age Publishing, 87-109.
- Harrison, C. , & Killion, J. (September, 2007). Ten roles for teacher leaders Teachers as leaders. *Educational Leadership*, 65(1), 74–77.
- Le Cornu, R. (2005). Peer mentoring: Engaging pre-service teachers in mentoring one another. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 13(3) 355-366.
- Mahaffey, B. A., & Mares, A. S. (2014). Mentoring for success in a two-year degree program: Peer mentors as expert helpers. In A. Howley, & M. B. Trube (Eds.), *Mentoring in the professions: Orienting toward the future*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Malone, D. M. (2008). Inquiry-based early childhood teacher preparation: The personal learning plan method. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 35(6), 531-542.
- Murray, K. (2011). Five tips for designing effective online learning modules. Tech Republic. Retrieved from <http://www.techrepublic.com/blog/five-apps/five-tips-for-designing-effective-online-learning-modules/>
- Piaget, J., & Inhelder, B. (1969). *The psychology of the child*. Basic Books.
- Sundli, L. (2006). Mentoring—A new mantra for education? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(2) 201-214.

- Teacher Leadership Exploratory Consortium. (n.d.). *Teacher leader model standards*. Retrieved from: https://www.ets.org/s/education_topics/teaching_quality/pdf/teacher_leader_model_standards.pdf
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1980). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wohlwend, K. E. (2013). *Literacy playshop: New literacies, popular media, and play in the early childhood classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wu, C. (1980). *Xi you ji (Journey to the West)*. Reprint. Beijing: Renmin wenxue.
- Wyatt, L. G. (2011). Nontraditional student engagement: Increasing adult student success and retention. *Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 59(1), 10-20.

About the Authors:

Pam Owen, Ed.D.,
Mount Vernon Nazarene University,
800 Martinsburg Road, Mount Vernon, Ohio 43050
Pam.Owen@mvnu.edu
Office 740-392-6868

Pamela M. Owen, Professor of Education at Mount Vernon Nazarene University earned an Ed.D in early Childhood Education from Ball State University. Her research has focused on issues relating to early childhood education with a special interest in play, The Project Approach, and curriculum design.

Mary Barbara Trube, Ed.D.,
Ohio University, Chillicothe Campus,
101 University Drive,
Chillicothe, Ohio 45601
trube@ohio.edu
Office 740-774-7200

Mary Barbara Trube, Professor of Education at Ohio University, Chillicothe Campus. She earned an Ed.D. in Educational Administration with a concentration in special education and a M.Ed in Educational Administration from The University of Texas at Austin, a M.Ed. in Early Childhood Education and a M.Ed. in Health and Physical Education from The University of Texas at Tyler, a B.S. in Elementary Education from Stephen F. Austin State University, and an Adult International Teacher of English to Speakers of Other Languages Certificate from the University of Cincinnati.

Krishana White, Ph.D.,
Mount Vernon Nazarene University,
800 Martinsburg Road, Mount Vernon, Ohio 43050
White@mvnu.edu
Office 740-392-6868

Krishana White, Instructor of Education at Mount Vernon Nazarene University has an earned MA in Education with a specialization of Intervention Specialist Mild/Moderate from Ashland University. She is currently pursuing an Ed.D. from Capella University in Reading and Literacy Education.

Laurie Katz, Ph.D.,
The Ohio State University,
127 Arps Hall,
1945 North High Street,
Columbus, Ohio 43210
katz.124@osu.edu
Office 614-292-2111

Teaching Reading is a Passion: A Passion with Impact

Sally Barnhart Owen, M.Ed., Rita Bitzer, M.Ed., and David Mark Meyers, Ph.D.

* Correspondence:

Sally Barnhart.

Xavier University

3800 Victory Parkway

Cincinnati, Ohio 45207

barnhart@xavier.edu

513-745-1081

Full list of author
information is available at
the end of the article

Abstract:

Four early childhood teacher educators used the case study methodology to discuss strategies and practices to develop pre-service teacher leaders during teacher preparation programs at three Ohio universities. The strategies used are grounded in the work accomplished by The Teacher Leadership Exploratory Consortium, specifically the Teacher Leader Model Standards (TLMS).

The TLMS outline high, demanding, but reasonable expectations for teachers; they are cross-walked with a variety of specialized professional associations (SPAs). Our early childhood case study strategies can be modified to be effective in multiple licensure areas.

INTRODUCTION

Reading has been an important Ohio initiative for many years. All teachers, parents, and community members are eager for all children to secure the necessary strategies to be successful readers and lifelong readers. The teaching of Reading is our passion, which is why each summer, Xavier University host approximately 150 children entering first – eighth grade and opportunity to work with Xavier Graduate students completing their Ohio Reading Endorsement and/or their Master's in Reading.

As you can imagine, the reading program allows for students at a variety of levels, and their parents, to receive more practice and developmental advice from a variety of educational perspectives. What might be more surprising is the impact upon the graduate students who participate in the summer reading program. The graduate students are better prepared for required licensure exams and report better preparation for their educational role utilizing these new skills and content.

Background


Xavier has a long history of hosting the Xavier Reading Practicum on campus. However, the past 15 years, a group of professors and expert classroom teachers have been assembled to implement and supervise what we refer to as The Xavier Reading Camp. The Xavier Reading Camp Directors and Supervisors collectively have over 200 years of experience in teaching Reading to children. In order to efficiently and effectively organize the summer program, the team works all year long to enhance and perfect this product, known as The Xavier Summer Reading Camp. The Xavier Reading Camp is an educational experience for the K-8 students and an opportunity for Xavier Graduate students to work in a clinical reading/tutor setting and make direct connections between theory and practice.

Graduate Student Learning Outcomes

The Xavier Reading team strives to implement and instruct the graduate student in the NCTE/IRA Standards, along with the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession. OSTP/NCTE/IRA Standards compliment the array of experiences that the Xavier Graduate Reading Student experience in the culmination of the Xavier Reading Endorsement. The Standards present the conduit through which the Graduate Reading Students can be prepared for the reality of reading education in today's schools. The Reading Program provides a means to introduce contextual based lessons grounded in the latest theories which apply current best practices. It is the combination of theory and practice establishing the program as a connection point towards entrance into professional practice. The Summer Reading experience allows the graduate students to not only fulfill a standard, they are prepared to enter the practice of reading education ready to make a difference.

COLLABORATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING

Graduate Students follow the Collaborative Problem Solving model: define problem, analyze data, set goals, develop action steps, and evaluate student's response to intervention.



Graduate Student Requirements: (which are supported by guidelines and rubrics)

- ▶ Daily Attendance and professional participation
- ▶ Informal Assessments, Initial Analysis and Summary on incoming children
- ▶ Daily Prescriptive Lesson Plans
- ▶ Week 1: Camp Newsletter
 - ▶ Grade level group overview including theme, goals of the Reading Camp, overview of assessments, strategies taught and practiced
- ▶ Week 2: Summary and Packet
 - ▶ A well written letter sent home to parents that includes an introductory paragraph, identification and description of assessments, identification of strengths and areas for growth, and suggestions for additional practice, enrichment and remediation.

Standards Crosswalk

The standards and expectations of professionalism in Reading education are woven throughout the program of student and the associated assessments.

By means of example, the NCTE/IRA Standards are cross-walked with Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession. Each standard is then exemplified by a description of a Summer Reading Program exercise.

Standard 1: Students read a wide range of print and non-print texts.

- *OSTP Standard 2: Teachers understand content area for which they have instructional responsibility.*

In order to support phonics, vocabulary, comprehension and fluency, the Xavier Graduate Students use several effective strategies to prompt the concept of print. Examples of the “Forest of Words”, “Take to the Stage” using Reader’s Theater, “Reading Around the World”, and a technology focus “Wired for Success”.

Standard 3: Students apply a wide range of strategies to comprehend, interpret, evaluate and appreciate texts.

- *OSTP Standard 4: Teachers plan and deliver effective instruction that advances the learning of each student.*

The Xavier Graduate Student prepare lessons that engage in explicit instruction, which include comprehension monitoring, cooperative learning, graphic organizers, sequencing of story structure (beginning, middle and end), as they monitor the individual child’s understanding of constructing meaning from print.

Standard 7: Students conduct research on issues and interests by generating ideas and questions, and by posing problems.

- *OSTP Standard 6 & Standard 7: Teachers Collaborate, communicate, professional growth with the learning community.*

The Xavier Graduate Student work together in collaborative teams of teachers by grade level to interpret data from the Jerry John’s Informal Reading Inventory, which is the instrument used to assess each child on the first day of camp. Individual and Group Lesson Plans are prepared for the children small groups and individuals to reinforce targeted teaching strategies that will enhance student learning. The Graduate Students sharing of their instructional strategies challenges each graduate student to implement effective instruction for the team and the children.

Standard 8: Students use a variety of technological and informational resources to gather and synthesize information.

- *OSTP Standard 5: Teachers create learning environments that promote high levels of learning.*

Technology is an important and effective approach to teaching and learning. The Xavier Graduate students use technology to implement instruction and to provide creative lessons. Xavier provides laptops for the children, during the two week Reading Camp.

Standard 9: Students develop and understanding of and respect for diversity in language use, patterns and dialects across cultures.

- *OSTP Standard 1: Teachers understand and respect the diversity of students that they teach.*

Cultural Diversity is an important student learning outcome for all Xavier Graduate Students. The Reading Camp provides the Graduate Student to work with children from all socio-economic backgrounds. The Open House, which is the Reading Camp Celebration, is a presentation that represents the “United Nations” with choral reading, song, dance representing “Reading Around the World.”

Standard 11: Students participate as knowledgeable, reflective, creative and critical members of a variety of literacy communities.

- *OSTP Standard 6: Teachers collaborate and work within the community to support student learning.*

The Xavier Graduate Students work in teams, three days before Reading Camp begins and each afternoon to re-plan, rethink and revise all lesson plans for the next day. The Xavier Graduate Student is supervised by Adjunct Professors and Classroom Teachers that have over 200 years’ experience in the classroom.

Standard 12: Students use spoken, written and visual language to accomplish their own purposes for learning and the exchange of information.

- *OSTP Standard 7: Teachers assume responsibility for professional growth.*

Xavier Graduate Students attend three Professional Development Days before the Xavier Reading Camp begins, which requires the reading of articles, development of lesson plans for Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening and working out the details of the daily schedule both whole group and small group.

The Pre-planning

Each spring enrollment opens on-line for the children (grades 1-8) to register for 2 weeks of Xavier Summer Reading Camp. All children are accepted from the community of schools. The Xavier Reading Camp has appropriate grade level size and diversity. The teacher to student ratio is approximately 4:1. A team of graduate students work together to individually assess each student, plan and implement lessons that meet the individual needs of each student.

Xavier Graduate Students have successfully completed all Graduate Reading Courses that are approved by the Ohio Department of Education, before enrolling in the Xavier Reading Practicum.

Planning Process

Three full days before the Xavier Reading Camp officially opens, the Graduate Students are on campus for Professional Development.

The Reading Camp Supervisors work closely with the Xavier Graduate Student to demonstrate modeling of ongoing informal assessments and provide opportunities for Graduate Students to practice meaningful effective skills and strategies that enable children to become successful readers. The following Reading Strategies are demonstrated by the Xavier Supervisor Team for the Graduate Students:

- **Phonological Awareness**
 - Rhyming Books “Cat in the Hat”, which supports word families and rhymes, as demonstrated in modeling of the strategy of oral reading.
 - Use objects or picture cards for initial and final sounds
- **Fluency**
 - Model difference between word by word reading and fluent phrasing
 - Use a highlighter to reinforce punctuation
- **Vocabulary**
 - Create a personal dictionary/provide picture clues
 - Use technology to bring words/definitions and literacy connection to “real life”
- **Comprehension**
 - Identify the main idea through story maps, taking book walks (turning pages in the book and looking for context clues.
 - Inferences: demonstrate a read aloud have students’ list observations, meaning from text and how do know/infer what the text means?

Opening of the Xavier Reading Camp School

On the first day of Reading Camp, the graduate student, using research based methods and practices, is responsible for an informal reading assessment of the 3 -5 children they are assigned from their grade level group. “Effective reading instruction begins with assessment” (Cooter and Perkins). In order to estimate the student’s independent and instructional reading levels, it is important to identify through assessment, the individuals word recognition errors in oral reading and determine what the student actually comprehends when reading orally. For instructional purposes, the assessor is looking for the Instructional Level to be at 95% accuracy or better in word recognition and 75 percent accuracy or better in comprehension. Through assessment the Reading Teacher plans and implements effective Reading instruction for the individual assessed. The instrument utilized for the informal assessment is the *Jerry John’s Basic Reading Inventory: Pre-Primer through Grade Twelve and Early Literacy Assessments*. The BRI is a scientifically based Reading Inventory, which

includes directions on how to administer, score and interpret the assessments, along with the graded word list, several grade level reading passages and along with comprehension questions.

Each child attending the Xavier Reading Camp will be assessed in the following:

- Interest Inventory
- Sight Vocabulary Assessment
- 3 Reading Samples (with either free retell or comprehension questions)
- A writing sample

The purpose of the BRI is for the teacher to gain knowledge and insight into the child's independent, instructional, frustration reading level, along with interest and attitudes of reading behavior. After completion of the individual BRI, a one page analysis of each child test will be written by the assessor, which will include the strengths and challenges of reading strategies identified from the assessment. The miscue analysis will guide the grade level team of teachers in a holistic tutoring approach to preparing lesson plans that meet the individual needs of the child.

Each day, a daily prescriptive lesson plan will be written for the whole group and for each individual child, in order to provide an effective remediation plan. The Xavier Graduate Student will meet with the grade level team and Xavier Supervisor in order to implement responsive instructional interventions, within the camp classroom setting. The analysis process will guide the teacher in determining the child's appropriate reading level and identify the "next steps". By the end of the first week, an analysis and summary has been prepared for each child, goals are identified and implementation of effective strategies is in place.

The Xavier Reading Camp follows the reading guidelines legislated in the Third Grade Reading Guarantee. Through individual lesson planning for each child, the teacher will use a variety of systematic and explicit instructional strategies to scaffold development and learning of phonological awareness, vocabulary development, fluency, comprehension and a wide range of literacy experiences in Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening. The continuous goal of the Xavier Reading Camp is to **explore** with each child (through observation, collecting data, speaking and listening), **engage** with each child and a team of experts (develop, analyze and design motivating lesson plans), along with **emerge** each child (create a learning environment that supports individual learns and differentiates instruction).

Throughout the Xavier Reading Camp, the Co-Directors, Supervisors and Graduate Students greet each child and their families before and after school each day. The children receive an engaging

warm environment which includes communication and an active participation in the camp environment. Each child participates in a closing ceremony, dramatic theatre presentation, which represents the Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening Strategies that were implemented within the grade level theme. The children demonstrate a creative approach to literacy through their topic research, oral presentations of music, dramatic play and technology enhancements. Practically speaking, the Xavier Graduate Students and Children have fun developing creative materials, implementing engaging lessons and collaborating with colleagues. Parents, Children and Teachers leave Xavier's campus smiling and excited about Literacy.

Reading Camp Schedule:

Graduate Student spends 24 hours or more planning their assessment and instruction before Reading Camp begins. Then before and after camp the Graduate Student continues to plan, create and implement individual and group lessons each day for approximately five hours. The ratio of Graduate Student to child is one graduate student assigned to approximately four children.

A typical day at Reading Camp involves Instruction in Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening

- 8:15 – 8:30 a.m. Greet the children and parents
- 8:30 – 9:00 a.m. Ice breakers, morning routines
- 9:00 – 9:30 a.m. Whole Group Presentations by Graduate Students in Grade Level Theme
- 9:30 – 11:00 a.m. Small Group Instruction, independent and individual work
- 11:00 – 11:30 a.m. Whole Group Instruction and dismissal
- At the end of the session, each Graduate Student walks the children to the dismissal area and greets the parents

On the last day of Xavier Reading Camp, each family will receive a comprehensive summative report, which provides documentation on each child's informal assessment, a description of the child's strengths and challenges, recommendations for continued success.

The Reading Assessment Analysis and Summative report includes:

- Interest Inventory
 - ▶ This portion of the assessment helps Graduate Students to get to know the child being tested. It is meant to set the tone for the testing, one that is personalized, conversational, relaxed and interactive.
 - ▶ This is an opportunity to build rapport with the child.
 - ▶ This is not a teaching time. Graduate Students encourage the child to respond to the interest inventory as independently as possible.
- Graded Word Lists used in testing (scored)

- ▶ This portion helps Graduate Students to determine which passage to begin with when testing the child.
- Graded Passages orally read (scored)
 - ▶ This portion helps to look closely at the types of miscues (deviations from the text) the child makes while reading. This assessment allows the examiner to find out how the child is decoding and comprehending text.
- Miscue Analysis and Retellings to determine child's instructional reading level
 - ▶ This portion helps to see what the child remembers and understands. Some time to calculate and analyze the miscues is also taken. This will allow the graduate students to determine the child's appropriate reading level and begin to identify "next steps".
- Writing Sample
 - ▶ This portion of the assessment helps Graduate Students to better understand the writing abilities of the child.
 - ▶ **This can include:**
 - ▶ spelling, grammar, and use of conventions
 - ▶ ability to stay on topic
 - ▶ details
 - ▶ organization of writing
 - ▶ Choose a prompt for the child or give the child 2 choices, it is meant as a quick write.
- Summative Report with a recommendation of a remediation plan for each student tested
- Completed and signed time sheet documenting hours

Feedback and comments have been gathered from all constituents in the Reading Camp. Sample reactions include:

- Parent:
 - *"My child told me to come see my classroom at Xavier Reading Camp, this is what school should look like". "My Child has fun and doesn't even realize how much he is reading and writing."*
- Graduate Student:
 - *"I have met and worked with new Teacher friends that have become my network in education. I contact my new teacher friends throughout the school year and meet often to discuss new Reading Strategies with them. "*
- Xavier Faculty:
 - *"The Team of Adjunct Professors have been working together for approximately 12 years. Each January, we recommit ourselves to making Xavier Reading Camp for both the Graduate Students and the children better than the year before, which creates a desire to meet for several months, before Reading Camp begins."*
- Xavier Co-Directors:
 - *"We have formed a professional collaboration since 2002, that has enabled us to tweak and improve the Xavier Reading Practicum and create a partnership with other*

school districts for professional development of teachers. Xavier Reading Camp is the best-kept secret in Cincinnati. We do not advertise, because our XU Graduate Students and Children completely fill the Cohen Building each summer. “

Results for Graduate Students

The parents and students benefit from the comprehensive summative report, providing strategies and key insight for future development, which has been seen to have a profound impact upon those students who are seen over the course of a number of years. However, the impact upon the graduate students participating in the reading camp is even more profound. In order to be licensed as a reading specialist in the State of Ohio, a licensure exam must be passed in addition to the completion of the course of study. A review of the results of this testing demonstrates a more powerful impact upon the graduate students through the participation in the summer reading program. The graduate students over the past three years have had an 86% first time passing rate on the licensing exam, which becomes a 96% passing rate for the year. This piece of data on the surface does not seem extraordinary, until participation in the summer reading program is factored into the equation. 100% of graduate students for the past three years who have participated in the summer reading program prior to taking the licensing examination have passed the exam. In addition, all students who failed the licensure exam prior to participating in the summer reading program, who then took the licensure exam passed. Finally, all graduate students from the past three years who have yet to pass the licensure exam have yet to participate in the summer reading program. The impact of the summer reading program was not a part of the original design of the program, however the results have impacted the recommendations for graduate students. The power of the summer reading program has been shared with the graduate students and it is the hope of the program that all graduate students will be able to participate in the program prior to licensing exam.

Xavier Reading Practicum Conclusions

Xavier University Reading Camp Co-Directors believe that through this collaborative and innovative approach, Xavier Graduate Students, Xavier Professors and Supervisors, Xavier and Cincinnati Community Children all benefit from the Professional Learning Community and Leadership established within the hands-on clinical learning experience.

Texts and Resources:

- ▶ Jerry Johns (2012), *Basic Reading Inventory: Pre-Primer through Grade 12 and Early Literacy Assessments* (Kendall/Hunt Publishing)
- ▶ Jerry Johns and Susan Davis (2001), *Improving Reading: Strategies and Resources* (Kendall/Hunt Publishing)
- ▶ Ohio's New Learning Standards for English Language Arts
 - ▶ <http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Ohio-s-New-Learning-Standards/English/ELA-Standards.pdf.aspx>

About the Authors:

Sally Barnhart
Co-Director, Xavier Reading Camp
Xavier University
3800 Victory Parkway
Cincinnati, OH 45207
barnhart@xavier.edu
513-745-1081

Rita Bitzer
Lakota Schools
Co-Director Xavier Reading Camp

.

D. Mark Meyers, Ph.D.,
Xavier University,
Meyersd3@xavier.edu
513-745-2821



PUBLICATION GUIDELINES

for the OHIO Journal of Teacher
Education

The following guidelines are presented for publication opportunities for OJTE (the OHIO Journal of Teacher Education).

The OHIO Journal of Teacher Education provides a forum for the exchange of information and ideas concerning the improvement of teaching and teacher education. Articles submitted should reflect this mission. Their focus should concern concepts, practices, and/or results of research that have practical dimensions, implications, or applicability for practitioners involved with teacher education. The journal is regional in scope and is sent as a benefit of membership in the Ohio Association of Teacher Education.

Manuscripts are subject to review of the Professional Journal Committee (co-editors and editor consultants). Points of view are those of the individual authors and are not necessarily those of either Association. Permission to reproduce journal articles must be requested from the editors.

MANUSCRIPT GUIDELINES

Content: Journal issues may be “thematic” or “open.” Currently, all future issues are designated “open.”

Length: Manuscripts, including all references, bibliographies, charts, figures, and tables, generally should not exceed 15 pages.

Style: For writing and editorial style, follow directions in the latest edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. Omit the author’s name from the title page. Include an 80-100-word abstract.

Please do not use auto-formatting when preparing the manuscript!



Cover page: Include the following information on a separate sheet attached to the manuscript: title of the article; date of submission; author's name, author's terminal degree; mailing address, e-mail address, business and home phone numbers, institutional affiliation; and short biographical sketch, including background and areas of specialization.

Submission: Submissions must be word processed using Microsoft Office Word (Microsoft Excel tables are permitted). Submit the manuscript as an attachment to an e-mail to oatejournal@gmail.com

EDITORIAL PROCEDURES

Authors will be notified of the receipt of the manuscript. After an initial review by the editors, those manuscripts which meet specifications will be sent to reviewers. Notification of the status of the manuscript will take place after the deadline date for each issue. The journal editors will make minor editorial changes; major changes will be made by the author prior to publication. Manuscripts, editorial correspondence, and questions can be directed to Dr. Mark Meyers and Dr. Jean Eagle at oatejournal@gmail.com

IMPORTANT DATES OF NOTE:

July 30, 2016	Closing date for acceptance of manuscripts for Fall Journal 2016
Publication date:	October, 2016 at OCTEO Conference
January 6, 2017	Closing date for acceptance of manuscripts for Spring Journal 2017
Publication Date:	March, 2017 at OCTEO Conference



MEMBERSHIP

Interested in becoming a member of OATE (Ohio Association of Teacher Educators)? Please visit the following website for current information: <https://sites.google.com/site/ohioate/home>

Additionally, information about OCTEO (Ohio Confederation of Teacher Education Organizations), Fall and Spring OCTEO Conferences, and presentational opportunities, can be found at the following site: <http://www.ohioteachered.org>.

Our organization looks forward to your interest in OATE and OCTEO in 2016 and 2017.